

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Period 188

יהוה



ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
MDCCCCX
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANK H. FOSTER, JAMES LINDSAY, CHARLES F. THWING, NEWELL

DWIGHT HILLIS, A. A. BERLE, W. E. BARTON, H. A. STIMSON

H. W. MAGOUN, A. S. BOOT, M. G. KYLE

W. H. G. THOMAS

VOL. LXIX

OBERLIN, OHIO
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

CHARLES HIGHAM & SON, LONDON

1912

123
/ 6.2

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXIX.

NO. CCLXXIII.

I. THE PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY OF LEADING OLD TESTAMENT CRITICS	1
BY PROFESSOR ALBERT C. KNUDSON, D.D., MALDEN, MASS.	
II. THE BEARING OF ONE'S PHILOSOPHY ON ONE'S CREED	22
BY THE REVEREND ROBERT E. NEIGHBOR, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.	
III. SOCIAL OR INDIVIDUAL REGENERATION.....	35
BY ARNOLD V. C. P. HUIZINGA, WEST NEWTON, MASS.	
IV. THE SCRIPTURAL FOUNDATION FOR CHRIS- TIAN UNITY	55
BY THE REVEREND BURNETT THEO. STAFFORD, JORDAN, NEW YORK.	
V. NIETZSCHE MADNESS	71
BY PRINCIPAL CHARLES H. LERCH, A.M., EASTON, PA.	
VI. MODERATE CRITICISM	88
BY THE REV. J. S. GRIFFITHS, UPPINGHAM, ENGLAND.	
VII. THE REVIVAL OF BUDDHISM IN JAPAN.....	100
BY THE REVEREND SAMUEL C. BARTLETT, OTARU, JAPAN.	
VIII. THE MINISTRY OF PAIN (I.).....	115
BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., WUCHANG, CHINA.	
IX. CRITICAL NOTES	136
Do We Want a Uniform Divorce Law?—Ralph E. Prime	
Preaching to the Spirits in Prison.—A. Eugene Thomson	
Dr. Driver on Exodus.—Harold M. Wiener.....	

X. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS	159
Palestine and its Transformation, by E. Huntington.—Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung, by W. Möller (H. M. W.).—Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version, by H. C. Hoskier.—The Date of the Composition of Deuteronomy, by H. Pope.—Documents of the Continental Reformation, by B. J. Kidd (W. H. G. T.).—The Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience, by A. L. Humphries (W. H. G. T.).—The Resurrection and Modern Thought, by W. J. S. Simpson (W. H. G. T.).—The Progress of Revelation, by G. A. Cooke.—Lollardy and the Reformation in England, by J. Gairdner (W. H. G. T.).—God in Evolution, by F. H. Johnson.—Divine Transcendence, by J. R. Illingworth (W. H. G. T.).—The Five Great Philosophies of Life, by W. D. Hyde.—Everyman's Religion, by G. Hodges.—Does Prayer Avail, by W. W. Kinsley.—The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, by S. M. Jackson.—The Mind of Primitive Man, by F. Boas.—Why I am Not a Higher Critic, by W. S. Tisdall.—The Four Faces, by P. S. Henson.—A Way of Honor, by H. Kingman.—Charles Darwin and Other English Thinkers, by S. P. Cadman.—Through the Mill, by A. Priddy. Books Received.	

NO. CCLXXIV.

I. TRIBUTE TO CHARLES MARSH MEAD. BY HIS FRIENDS	185
BY GEORGE NYE BOARDMAN, D.D., NEW YORK CITY.	
II. CHRIST IN THE FOUR GOSPELS.....	222
BY THE REVEREND EDWARD P. GARDNER, D.D., CHESTER, NEW JERSEY.	
III. THE DIVORCE PROBLEM: A RATIONAL RELIGIOUS VIEW	242
BY THE REVEREND CHARLES CAVERNO, LL.D., LOMBARD, ILLINOIS.	

IV. CATHOLICISM AND AMERICANISM	269
BY AUSTIN BIERBOWER, ESQ., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.	
V. THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS CONCERNING JESUS	288
BY HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.	
VI. SOME ASPECTS OF THE CONSERVATIVE TASK IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM (II.).....	310
BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., LONDON, ENGLAND.	
VII. THE PURPOSE OF THE BOOK OF RUTH.....	329
BY PROFESSOR LOUIS B. WOLFENSON, MADISON, WISCONSIN	
VIII. CRITICAL NOTE	345
The Negeb in Exodus.—Harold M. Wiener..... 345	
IX. A CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. GORDON.....	349
X. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.....	358
The Religion of the Ancient Celts, by J. A. MacCulloch (A. E. D.).—The Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism, by J. I. Munro (W. H. G. T.).—The End of the Law, by M. G. Glazebrook (W. H. G. T.).—The Making of the Bible, by A. E. Dunning.—What About the Old Testament, by A. C. Robinson.—The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature, by A. S. Zerbe (M. G. K.).—The Beatitudes and the Contrasts, by H. Foston (W. H. G. T.).—The Trial of Our Faith, by T. Hodgkin (W. H. G. T.).—The Resurrection and the Life, by G. Hanson.—The Philocalia of Origen, by G. Lewis.—The Development of Trinitarian Doctrine in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, by W. S. Bishop.—The Work of the Ministry, by W. H. G. Thomas.—The Present Day Problem of Crime, by A. H. Currier.—A Country Parish, by F. S. Child.—The Pilgrims of Iowa, by T. O. Douglass.—The Modern Man's Religion, by C. R. Brown.—The Life of Dr. D. K. Pearsons, by E. F. Williams.—Calvin Wilson Mateer, by D. W. Fisher.—The Makers and Teachers of Judaism, by C. F. Kent.—The Quakers in the American Colonies, by R. M. Jones (F. B. W.).—Books Received.	

NO. CCLXXV.

I.	THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	377
	BY THE REVEREND A. TROELSTRA, D.D., THE HAGUE, NETHERLANDS.	
II.	REASONABLE BIBLICAL CRITICISM	409
	BY THE REVEREND W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D., TORONTO, CANADA.	
III.	THE SADDUCEAN CHRISTIANS OF DAMASCUS.	421
	BY THE REVEREND G. MARGOLIOUTH, LONDON, ENGLAND.	
IV.	THE MINISTRY OF PAIN (II.)	438
	BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., WUCHANG, CHINA.	
V.	TWO NEW VOLUMES OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY	464
	BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., LONDON, ENGLAND.	
VI.	CHRIST AND THE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM	492
	BY THE REVEREND DAVID FINLEY BONNER, D.D., ENDICOTT, NEW YORK.	
VII.	THE HISTORY OF THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AND ITS NEWER REPRESENTATION	513
	BY EDUARD FRIEDRICH KÖNIG, D.D., BONN, GERMANY.	
VIII.	CRITICAL NOTE	522
	Paul's Transformation in Character.—Howell M. Haydn	522
IX.	NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS	527
	Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Baby- lonia and Assyria, by M. Jastrow (K. F.)—Gedan- ken über die Entwicklung der Religion, auf Grund der babylonischen Quellen, by A. Schmidt (K. F.). —Biblical and Theological Studies, by Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary.— The Person of Christ in Modern Thought, by E. D. La Touche.—The Historicity of Jesus, by S. J. Case.—Authority and The Authority of Might and Right, by A. v. C. P. Huizinga.—Lutheran Ger- many and the Book of Concord, by J. O. Evjen.—	

Miscellanies, by A. H. Strong.—The Old Lamp, by T. Whitelaw (J. L.).—The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, by S. M. Jackson.—The Chinese Revolution, by A. J. Brown.—De Naam Gods in den Pentateuch, by A. Troelstra (H. M. W.).—A Short Introduction to the Old Testament, by F. E. Spencer (H. M. W.).—Sociological Study of the Bible, by L. Wallis.—The Source of the Christian Tradition, by E. Dujardin.—The Religions of Modern Syria and Palestine, by F. J. Bliss.—Periodical Articles of Religion, 1890-1899, by E. C. Richardson.—The Composition of Matter and the Evolution of Mind, by D. Taylor.—Books Received.

THE TACTICS OF THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW	547
CHARGE OF THE STONEWALL REGIMENT.....	549
BY PROFESSOR GABRIEL CAMPBELL, HANOVER, N. H.	

NO. CCLXXVI.

I. PROFESSOR PETRIE'S EXCAVATIONS AT HELIOPOLIS, THE BIBLICAL ON.....	553
BY THE REVEREND MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., PHILADELPHIA, PA.	
II. THE MINISTRY OF PAIN (III.).....	565
BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., WUCHANG, CHINA.	
III. THE QUESTION OF A REFORM OF ROMANISM..	591
BY PROFESSOR HENRY C. SHELDON, D.D., WEST NEWTON, MASS.	
IV. JOHN HENRY NEWMAN: A STUDY.....	618
BY THE REVEREND GEORGE NYE BOARDMAN, D.D., NEW YORK CITY.	
V. "DEUTERONOMY: ITS PLACE IN REVELATION"	642
BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., LONDON, ENGLAND.	

VI. NEW METHODS OF INQUIRY CONCERNING THE PENTATEUCH	657
BY JOHANNES DAHSE, FREIBACHDORF, GERMANY.	
VII. PROBLEMS OF THE PASSION WEEK.....	664
BY DEAN ALFRED MARTIN HAGGARD, DES MOINES, IOWA.	
VIII. JESUS THE RABBI.....	693
BY LESTER REDDIN, B.D., MILTON, PA.	
IX. NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.....	707
The Deciding Voice of the Monuments, by M. G. Kyle.—Pentateuchal Studies, by H. M. Wiener.—Geschichte der Alttestamentlichen Religion kritisch dargestellt, by E. König (H. M. W.).—Alttestamentliche Studien, by B. D. Erdmans (H. M. W.).—Zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament, by C. H. Cornill (H. M. W.).—The Religion of Israel Under the Kingdom, by A. C. Welch.—Primitive Christianity and Early Criticisms, by A. S. Garretson.—A History of English Literature from Beowulf to Swinburne, by A. Lang (J. L.).—The Promise of the Christ-Age in Recent Literature, by W. E. Mosher.—Greece and Babylon, by L. R. Farnell.—The School in the Home, by A. A. Berle.—Cumorah Revisited, by C. A. Shook.—Was Christ Divine, by W. W. Kinsley.—The Fundamentals.	
THE ONLY WAY: A CORRESPONDENCE	723
INDEX	727
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND COURSES IN BIBLE READING	737
H. M. MAGOUN, PH.D., REV. J. L. CAMPBELL, D.D., REV. RICHARD WRIGHT.	

THE

BIBLIOTHECA



A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITED

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

FRANK H. FORTER, JAMES LINDSAY, CHARLES E. THWING, NEWELL DWIGHT
 HILLIS, A. A. DERLE, WILLIAM E. BARTON, HENRY A. STIMSON
 STEPHEN W. MAGOUN, A. S. ROOT, MELVIN C. KYLE
 W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS

CONTENTS

THE PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY OF THE LEADING OLD TESTA- MENT CRITICS	Albert C. Knudson	1
THE BEARING OF ONE'S PHILOSOPHY ON ONE'S CREED	Robert E. Neighbor	22
SOCIAL OR INDIVIDUAL REGENERATION?	Arnold V. D. P. Huizinga	35
THE SCRIPTURAL FOUNDATION FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY	Burnett Theo. Stafford	65
NIETZSCHE MADNESS	Charles H. Lersch	71
MODERATE CRITICISM	G. S. Griffiths	68
THE REVIVAL OF BUDDHISM IN JAPAN	Samuel C. Bartlett	100
THE MINISTRY OF PAIN (A)	Edward M. Merriam	115
CRITICAL NOTES		136
Do We Want a Uniform Divorce Law?	Ralph E. Prime	120
Preaching to the Spirits in Prison	A. Eugene Thomsen	142
Dr. Delver on Exodus	Harold M. Wiener	151
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS		180

OVERLIN, OHIO, U. S. A.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

ENGLISH AGENTS: CHARLES HUGHES & SON
 27a DARTMOUTH STREET, LONDON, E. C.

SINGLE NUMBER, 75 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00

Entered at the Post Office in Oberlin as second-class matter.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

Volume LXIX. 1912

In 1843 the *Bibliotheca Sacra* was founded by Dr. Edward Robinson, and three numbers were issued in New York City. In 1844 it was removed to Andover, Massachusetts, where the publication of the present series began under the editorship of Professor Bela E. Edwards and Edwards A. Park, with the special cooperation of Dr. Robinson and Professor Moses Stuart. In 1853 the *American Biblical Repository* (which was begun in Andover in 1831 by Dr. Robinson and later removed to New York City) was united with the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. In 1864 the *Christian Register* (the organ of the Baptists) and in 1873 the *Theological Educator* were merged with it. Professor Edwards A. Park continued as its principal editor until the close of its last full volume (1883). Since that time, for a period of twenty-seven years, Professor C. Frederick Wright has been its leading editor, and with representative associate editors has continued the *Quarterly* in the line of its original promoters.

Never in all its history has the *Bibliotheca Sacra* had a wider or richer list of contributors than at this at the present time. Its contributors give it, in all the centers of learning throughout the world, a unique place among American periodicals. Its statements of the eternal truths of criticism, science, philosophy, sociology, and theology should be read, pondered, and opposed by every man who seeks to get at all below the surface of things. Its 54,000 pages constitute a library of unrivaled excellence.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

THE PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY OF LEADING OLD TESTAMENT CRITICS.

BY PROFESSOR ALBERT C. KNUDSON, D.D., MALDEN, MASS.

It is frequently asserted that many of the conclusions to which modern biblical critics have come, are due to an un-Christian philosophy rather than to the logic of facts; but this assertion is seldom accompanied by any attempt at proof. It will, therefore, be a matter of interest to inquire into the history of biblical criticism, with the view of determining how far, if at all, this charge is justified. The present study will confine itself to the Old Testament.

In the history of Old Testament criticism, there are eight names of preëminent significance: Benedict Spinoza (1632-77), Richard Simon (1638-1712), Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827), Martin Leberecht De Wette (1780-1849), Heinrich Ewald (1803-75), Wilhelm Vatke (1806-82), Abraham Kuenen (1828-91), and Julius Wellhausen (1844-). There are, to be sure, other Old Testament scholars of note who, in some regards, would be worthy to rank with any of these. But these eight, in my opinion, mark more clearly than any others the chief stages in the development of Old Testament criticism.

Vol. LXIX. No. 273. 1

To Spinoza belongs the distinction of having first outlined the program of modern biblical study. He clearly formulated the principles of a strictly grammatical and historical treatment of the Old Testament, and in several matters of detail anticipated, in a remarkable way, the conclusions of later scholarship.

Simon was the first to write a critical history of the Old Testament as literature. He devoted his attention, however, chiefly to the history of the Text and the Versions. It is, therefore, a question whether he is entitled to be called, as he sometimes is, the father of Old Testament introduction. There is, also, not much that is new in the matter that he presents. But the genuine historical spirit which pervades the work, and the method which he introduced into the treatment of the subject, were new, and mark an epoch in biblical study.

Eichhorn, who was the first to apply the name "higher criticism" to the analysis of the biblical books into their earlier and later elements, was also the first to write a comprehensive introduction to the Old Testament from this point of view. For this reason, he is often spoken of as the founder of Old Testament criticism. While not the author of the documentary hypothesis with reference to the structure of the Pentateuch, it was he who first gave it general currency.

De Wette was the first clearly to see and point out the serious difficulties involved in the traditional view of the course of Israel's history. That history, he contended, could not be reconciled with its alleged starting-point. Hence the books of Chronicles are unreliable, and the Pentateuch is for the most part unhistorical. Deuteronomy he assigned to the seventh century. In the study of the Pentateuch he was, as Wellhausen says, the "epoch-making pioneer of historical criticism."

To Ewald belongs the distinction of embodying the main results of criticism, reached up to his time, in a monumental history of Israel. So far as the conception of the general course of Old Testament history is concerned, his work marked no advance. Indeed, it is claimed, and perhaps justly, that by the influence of his great name he stayed for a quarter of a century the normal development of historical criticism. Nevertheless, by his preëminent genius as an interpreter of Scripture and by the immense extent of his labors, he did more than any other man before or since his time to promote the critical study of the Old Testament.

Vatke's significance lies in the fact that as early as 1835 he wrote a work in which he anticipated the conclusions to which Old Testament critics in general have come only during the past twenty or thirty years. The most important new feature in this work was the assignment of the Priestly Code to the post-exilic period. But the importance of the work did not lie simply in this conclusion with reference to the development of Old Testament literature, but in the masterly exposition which it gives of Israel's history from this new standpoint. Wellhausen declares that this book of Vatke's is "the most important contribution ever made to the history of ancient Israel," and says that from it he himself "learned best and most."

To Kuenen belongs the credit of reviving Vatke's theory concerning the date of the Priestly Code, and contributing more to its establishment as an article of faith in the critical school than any other man, except Wellhausen. His work on "The Religion of Israel," written from this point of view, was epoch-making in its field.

Wellhausen enjoys the distinction of bringing the debate of almost a century concerning the structure and origin of

the Pentateuch practically to a close. His "Prolegomena to the History of Israel" was, as Kuenen says, "the crowning fight in the long campaign." With such extraordinary skill and ability did he marshal the facts in favor of the late date of the Levitical law, that the leading Old Testament scholars one after the other yielded to his conclusion. And at present this view with reference to the development of Old Testament literature is generally regarded as an assured result of criticism.

Since these eight names thus stand in the most intimate connection with the development of Old Testament criticism, they may be taken as representative of the movement as a whole. We proceed, therefore, to state briefly their philosophical and theological views, with the purpose of determining the relation of philosophical and theological standpoint to the work of Old Testament critics in general.

Among students of Spinoza, there is a difference of opinion as to whether he should be classed as a pantheist or as an atheistic monist. Some have indeed claimed him as a theist. A century or so ago, Goethe spoke of him as "superlatively theistic, superlatively Christian." But the weak sentimentalism which gathered about his name at about that time, as a result of the reaction against the irreligious deism of the eighteenth century, has now most of it passed away. If any religious character attaches to his philosophic system, it can be only that of pantheistic mysticism. His identification of God with nature, his thoroughgoing necessitarianism, his rejection of the notion of purpose in every form, and his exclusively intellectualistic or rationalistic attitude toward life and history, remove him about as far from Christian theism as one could well get. Whether he be called a pantheist or athe-

ist is a matter of slight consequence. The question is one chiefly of words. Anyhow, the same naturalistic scheme is implied in both pantheism and atheism. And it was from this naturalistic standpoint that Spinoza approached the Scriptures, and the subject of religion in general. He looked upon each as purely and simply a natural product, and that not of the highest type. His own system, of course, left no room for miracle. But he did not reject the miraculous narratives of Scripture as mythical; he treated them as highly colored reports of natural events. The only thing that appealed to him in the Bible was its ethical content; and this he regarded as presented in an imperfect form, as it necessarily had to be, so he thought, in order to be adapted to the multitude. For religion in its positive and popular form he had a feeling of disdain. It was irrational. His own religion, or rather substitute for it, was an apotheosis of intellect. He himself called it "the intellectual love of God." By this he meant simply a passion for and delight in knowledge as such, a devotion to truth for its own sake; and not a religious sentiment. It was this accommodated use of language on his part that led, later, to such an extraordinary misunderstanding of his teaching,—perhaps the most remarkable instance of the kind in the history of philosophy.

Richard Simon studied Descartes in his earlier years, and was a Roman Catholic throughout his life. But he had no special interest in philosophy and theology as such. The Cartesian principle of doubt probably stimulated him in his researches, and the Roman Catholic stress on tradition may have given him a feeling of freedom as over against the Scriptures which he would not have had as a Protestant. But these matters were wholly incidental to his work and of no special significance. By nature he was a rationalist. He was

devoid of deep religious feeling, had no taste for poetry, and felt a distinct aversion to everything mystical in religion. His membership in the Order of Oratory would naturally have led him to attach himself to the Jansenist movement; but the Augustinian type of theology, to which this movement was committed, was repugnant to him. He allied himself with the latitudinarian element in his church, and apparently had no inclination to seek any other fellowship. This was not due to any hearty adoption of the Roman Catholic standpoint in theology, but rather to indifference to it. Theological conviction with him was a subordinate matter. His interests were primarily philological, critical, and historical. It was from these points of view that he approached the Scriptures. And so long as he was permitted to carry on his investigations in these fields, he was quite willing to subscribe to the official theology, and even to become an apologist for it. His divergencies, however, from the traditional view with reference to the origin of the Scriptures, and his free criticism of the church fathers, were far from being in harmony with the dominant temper of his church. His connection with it is therefore to be regarded as accidental.

Eichhorn was a product of the German *Aufklärung*. Under the influence of Herder, he struggled against some of its tendencies, but succeeded only imperfectly in overcoming them. He accepted in a general way the current naturalistic deism, and followed to a large extent the current rationalistic method of interpreting Scripture. Still he was sympathetic with the church, and sought to win back the educated classes to religion. It was his conviction that many had been led to look with scorn upon the Scriptures because of the miraculous character mistakenly attributed to them. One of his professed purposes, consequently, in writing his "Introduction to the

Old Testament," was to commend the Bible to such people, by showing them that its supposed miraculous and supernatural elements were, for the most part, due "to pure misunderstanding and to ignorance of the oriental style of speech." On this latter point he laid particular stress. But while not accepting the miraculous element himself, he did not offensively reject it. On this subject he maintained, on the whole, a conciliatory attitude. His own critical conclusions were remarkably conservative. He defended the genuineness of the Pentateuch, contending for its origin in the Mosaic age. Still, his interest in the Bible was chiefly literary and historical. He had no deep appreciation of its religious contents. Religion itself did not appeal strongly enough to him to enable him to penetrate into the heart of the Scriptures.

De Wette was a theologian as well as a critic. He came at first under the influence of the cold rationalism of Paulus, but from this was soon delivered by Fries—a philosopher in whom there has recently been a revival of interest in Germany. Fries combined the Kantian criticism with the faith-philosophy of Jacobi. He restricted the intellect to the phenomenal order, but held that the mind through its feelings laid immediate hold of the ideal world of reality, of God and immortality. He thus stood opposed to the pantheistic and intellectualistic tendencies of Hegelianism. He believed firmly in the personality of God, and put the emotions above the logical processes of the mind. Still, he held to a kind of religious apriorism. Religious truths, he taught, are independent of history; they are innate in the human mind. History simply furnishes symbols of them. This conception of history, De Wette enthusiastically accepted from Fries, and applied to his study of the Scriptures, and of theology in general. In harmony with it, he placed much less stress than had hitherto

been done on the authenticity and historicity of the biblical documents. He assigned, for instance, the great body of the Pentateuch to a relatively late date, and rejected the biblical miracles, viewing them not as exaggerations or misunderstandings of actual events, but as myths. Along, however, with this negative attitude toward the traditional teaching of the church, De Wette had a warm and profound interest in the positive and practical side of Christianity. These diverse tendencies he thought it possible to harmonize by the theory of symbolism, that is, by treating biblical history and Christian dogmas as symbolic of religious ideas. But his own attempt in this direction did not prove satisfactory, even to himself. As he grew older he became more and more conservative. This appears clearly in his attitude toward miracles. At first, he said that, for the educated mind, it was "settled" that miracles never actually occurred. Later, he wrote that it was "at least doubtful" if they had ever taken place. And still later, he declared, in criticism of Strauss, that "the appearance of Jesus Christ as the sinless, infallible, perfect man is the first and supreme miracle upon which all others depend, and the primary question has to do with faith in this miracle. By this it is to be decided who holds with us and who not."

Ewald had no early training either in philosophy or in systematic theology. He was, however, a profoundly religious man, and theological questions had an intense interest for him. He combined more perfectly than any one up to his time the spirit of criticism and the spirit of faith. As Wellhausen says, "he had the utmost confidence in science as well as in Christianity and lived in perfect peace with both." His theological position may be described as that of a moderate evangelical orthodoxy. The traditionalists of his day regarded him as an enemy of the faith, and he in turn took the same attitude

toward the Tübingen school. He had no sympathy with any form of religious apriorism, attaching himself unreservedly to historic Christianity. A recent biographer thus sums up his views on the central points of Christian theology: "He held to the unique divinity of Christ, and, unlike Schleiermacher, he looked upon Jesus as realizing in a very special manner the prophecies and types of the Old Testament. He believed in the sinless life, in the all-availing death, in the literal resurrection, and in the eternal glory of him who was born in Bethlehem." From this summary of his theology, it would seem clear that Ewald must have accepted the reality of miracles. Yet on this point there is a difference of opinion. Wellhausen, for instance, says: "He fills his mouth with miracles, but does not believe in them," and Pfeiderer remarks: "He does not actually believe in miracles, but does not openly deny them." Such statements as these are probably due to the fact that Ewald laid no special stress on physical miracles as such. The great miracles with him were psychological. Hence, in his description of the biblical miracles, he frequently did not commit himself on the question of their objective reality one way or the other. He felt no necessity of so doing, for the data did not seem to him decisive. On the general subject of miracles he says in his "History of Israel": "The province of religion is also that of miracle, inasmuch as it is that of the pure and strong faith in the presence and operation of heavenly powers, in doing as well as suffering" (vol. iv. p. 83). It was this deep spiritual faith that gave to Ewald an appreciation of biblical religion such as was new in the history of criticism. Himself "a prophet with backward gaze," he interpreted the prophets of old to the modern mind as it had not been done before.

Vatke was a philosopher and theologian as well as a

critic. In criticism he received his chief inspiration from De Wette; in philosophy he was during his earlier years, when he did his most important work, a thoroughgoing Hegelian. It was his aim, in his reconstruction of Old Testament history, to furnish a practical application of the Hegelian philosophy of history. In this regard, and also as regards his conclusions, he may be called the Strauss of the Old Testament. As Strauss reduced the Gospel narratives for the most part to myths, so Vatke concluded that the Pentateuch was almost wholly mythical. In their general theory of religion they also agreed, though Strauss was bolder in some of his ideas, and also in his expression of them. Rejecting miracle and the personality of God, they translated Christianity, in true Hegelian fashion, into speculative ideas. Vatke, for instance, says: "I do not to be sure pray to a person, but I immerse myself in the thought and feeling of an intensive Eternal, which is richer in content than religious prayer." With such an attitude toward positive religion, it is not surprising that his book on the Old Testament, significant as it later became, did not commend itself, at the outset, to Christian scholars. And had it not been possible to separate between the author's theology and his critical views, it is certain that the latter would never have attained their present vogue.

Kuenen was a frank and vigorous exponent of the naturalistic view of biblical history. Two of his leading works—that on "The Religion of Israel," and that entitled "The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel"—are in the nature of polemics against supernaturalism. His attitude on this point is said to have been arrived at empirically, but it must also have stood in close relation to his philosophy and theology. He calls himself a theist. But theism is an elastic term; and, in view of its good reputation, is becoming more and more so.

Kuenen himself, for instance, says: "In a truly ethical pantheism I can recognize a form of theism not incompatible with Christianity." And in the light of this remark, how far his own theism, with its "staunch determinism," is to be distinguished from pantheism, is a question. In any case, his persistent polemic against the supernatural shows such a want of sympathy with historic Christian theism that whatever theistic faith he may himself have professed must be regarded as differing in important regards from that of the church. And of this he himself was well aware. The denial of the supernatural was with him no mere question of history, it was a question of *Weltanschauung*, a question that affected the very nature of religion. This is clear not only from his books, but also from the so-called "modern" movement in Holland, of which he was a leader. This movement was, as Wicksteed says, "an attempt of singular boldness and vigor to shake the tradition of Christian piety free from every trace of supernaturalism and implied exclusiveness." It is true that, along with his denial of the exceptional character of biblical religion, Kuenen made extraordinary acknowledgments with reference to its ethical superiority; but he was always careful to add that this did not imply any superiority of origin. This view, which he repeatedly expresses, can be regarded only as philosophically superficial and religiously offensive. It was probably due to want of philosophical training, and lack of religious warmth. "Dry as cork" was the way his critics described him; to which his friends indeed replied, "But clear as glass." This clearness, however, did not extend into the higher ranges of philosophic and religious truth. His naturalistic theism did not rise much above the naturalistic deism of a century ago.

Wellhausen received his chief impulse to Old Testament

study from Ewald, but in his distinctively critical work "learned best and most" from Vatke. In philosophy he was in his student days strongly influenced by Lotze, and seems since to have adhered to the general type of thought which Lotze represented. Toward the close of his "*Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*" he makes this profession of faith: "I am not a mere part of the mass of mankind, a product of my time and environment, as science proclaims in tones of triumph, — as though there were cause to triumph in that. In the center of my being I come into contact with the eternal. To be sure, I must for myself win and unfold this inner life. And to this end I must, above all else, believe in it; I must believe that I do not perish in the mill in which I am driven about and bruised, but that God stands behind and above the mechanism of the world, that He can work upon my soul, can draw it upwards to Himself and help it to reach its own ideal, and that He is the living bond of an unseen and eternal fellowship of spirits. Man does not live by demonstration but by faith. Faith in freedom and faith in God are the same; one does not exist without the other. Both freedom and God are found only by faith. But faith need not be troubled. Faith is certainty."

Wellhausen also professes to find in the Scriptures "a real revelation from the living God"; and it is said that he regards it as the end of all his work "to set forth this revelation with convincing clearness." He furthermore speaks of Jesus as "a divine miracle," and says that He was "more than a prophet; in Him the word was made flesh." In spite, however, of such utterances as these, and in spite of his theistic faith, he discards the miraculous altogether. In doing so, he did not indeed assume the rôle of an advocate of anti-supernaturalism; but still he did break with the historic Chris-

tian faith. And when, in 1882, he left the theological faculty of Greifswald, it was, as he said, with "the distinct consciousness of occupying no longer the standpoint of the evangelical church nor that of Protestantism."

As we now look back over this survey of the philosophical and theological views of the leading Old Testament critics, it appears that most of them occupied distinctly heretical positions. Spinoza and Vatke were clearly non-Christian in their philosophy. The naturalism of Eichhorn, De Wette in his earlier years, Kuenen, and Wellhausen is also out of harmony with historic Christianity. Simon's position in the Roman Catholic Church was anomalous. He was really heretical, in spite of his protestations to the contrary. The only one who could be classed as evangelical in his belief was Ewald. He accepted the miraculous element in Scripture, and felt himself at one with the historic faith of the church. All the others, with the exception of Simon, rejected miracles, and held to some form of religious apriorism, either intellectualistic or æsthetic.

In view of these facts, it is not surprising that many look with suspicion upon the conclusions to which Old Testament criticism has come. They have the idea that these conclusions are the outcome of unbelief, rather than of any purely scientific method of biblical study. And for this notion there is undoubtedly some justification. It must first, however, be pointed out that there are manifest reasons why the critical movement should originate, and for a time be prosecuted outside of the circles dominated by an earnest Christian faith. For one thing, only there could the necessary freedom be found. For ages, Christian piety had been so intimately bound up with certain views concerning the origin of the Scriptures,

that its very existence seemed to be involved in the maintenance of those views. Any attempt, then, at their revision, in quarters where religious conviction was strong, would necessarily have met with strenuous opposition. Again, the impulse to such revision was, primarily, intellectual. The men who engaged in it were, most of them, moved by a passion for knowledge rather than religion. And such men under modern conditions of life naturally found the extra-ecclesiastical atmosphere more congenial to them. Their knowledge might be pursued for its own sake, regardless of consequences. Furthermore, the stress on the natural, as opposed to the miraculous, which underlies modern criticism, was necessarily at the outset more or less repugnant to religious minds. To treat the Bible as one does other books seemed, at first, sacrilegious. It is, then, not strange that the critical movement took its rise outside of the main current of Christian thought, and maintained itself almost exclusively there for some time.

We recur now to the influence which un-Christian philosophical and theological views have exerted on the development of Old Testament criticism. And here we must distinguish between the main conclusions of critics with reference to the history of Old Testament literature on the one hand, and their attitude toward and estimate of the religious contents of the Old Testament on the other. So far as the former are concerned, it cannot be shown that any one of them is the direct outcome of any special philosophical or theological standpoint. Take, for instance, the late date of the Priestly Code, which seems to give chief offense to many conservatives. It is true that both Vatke and George, who first promulgated this view, were Hegelians. But that the view itself was logically deduced from the Hegelian theory of de-

velopment is by no means clear. Bruno Bauer started with the same Hegelian theory, and from that point of view defended the Mosaic origin of the Old Testament law. Again, there is no doubt that the philosophic basis which Vatke gave to his critical views interfered with their acceptance. It deterred Reuss, who had reached the same general conclusion even before the publication of Vatke's views, from reading his book. And when this theory of the origin of the Priestly Code was later revived, and finally accepted, by the great body of critics, it was on altogether other grounds than its harmony with the Hegelian philosophy. Otherwise, scholars occupying the believing standpoint would not have accepted it. It cannot, to be sure, be denied that, in the development of this view, antipathy to the miraculous played a part. The influence of this antipathy is clearly traceable in De Wette, Vatke, Kuenen, and Wellhausen. But this attitude of the leading advocates of the theory prejudiced the minds of many against it, rather than the reverse. No doubt its final adoption by many evangelical scholars implied, on their part, the relinquishment of the older jealousy for the miraculous as such, and also the relaxation, to some degree, of the older notion that strict historicity is essential to the idea of revelation. But apart from these inevitable concessions to modern thought, the acceptance of the late date of the Levitical law involved no necessary departure from the Christian theology of the past. And the same is also to be said of all the other main conclusions of Old Testament criticism.

But when we come to the general attitude of many of the leading critics to the Old Testament, and to their estimate of its religious contents, the situation is different. Here the operation of philosophical and theological presuppositions is not only evident; it is the decisive thing. And here it is also

that critics have given chief offense to the church. There are two fundamental points, as we have seen, in which most of the leading Old Testament critics have departed from historic Christianity; namely, in their dogmatic rejection of the miraculous, and in their religious apriorism. The latter naturally carries with it the rejection of the authoritative significance of biblical history, and the former has frequently led, not only to an irreverent treatment of the biblical miracles, but to the depreciation of the Scriptures as a whole.

Of these two departures from Christian teaching, religious apriorism is the more fundamental. If religious truth is innate, in the sense that it develops of itself in the human mind without any determinative word from without, it is clear that history is of subordinate significance to religion. It may furnish symbols of religious truth; but myths would serve that purpose about as well. It is not, then, a matter of vital importance, whether Scripture contains historical elements or not. If the negative should ever be proved, the *idea* of Christianity would still remain; and *that*, it is claimed, is the only important thing. This line of reasoning has, in recent times, been adopted by some as a refuge from the destructive work of criticism. No historical fact, it is said, can be established with absolute certainty. History at the best can only give probability. It cannot, therefore, be made the basis of religious faith. For faith requires unshakable certainty. And this can be found only in the heart itself. The specious air of piety with which this view is presented, at first deceives some. But its amateurish, superficial, and abstract character is evident on careful reflection. Our faith in God is exposed to philosophic criticism in the same sense that our faith in Christ is exposed to historical criticism. From the logical point of view, one is no more "certain" than the other. To

suppose that faith ought to show its superiority to historical criticism by assuming an attitude of indifference to the most radical conclusions of critics, is as absurd as to hold that it might with impunity be allied with a materialistic philosophy. The latter extreme, indeed, as well as the former, has in recent years been advocated. But both are irrational. The historic Christian faith has as much, and no more, to fear from the historical criticism of to-day than the theistic faith of a century ago had to fear from the philosophic criticism of its time. And as for religious certainty, we have in it the product of a complex process. It is due to no single cause, subjective or objective. It is, however, certainly true, that nothing has contributed so much to it as the historic movement which found its fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth. Furthermore, religious faith is not identical with the universal longings of the human heart for some higher power to which it can link itself. Such native longings are the condition of faith, but they are not faith. Hunger does not feed itself. Food must come from without. And so faith, to be faith, needs an objective assurance. It needs the divine word of authority. It is here that the fatal defect in Kuenen's conception of prophecy is to be found. He sees in it "a testimony, not as out of heaven to us, but a testimony to men's need, and to Israel's peculiar destination to seek the Lord, if haply, they might feel after him, and find him." But a mere testimony to our need does not satisfy the need. Such a view of Scripture not only denies the function of revelation in the production of faith; it betrays ignorance of the very nature of faith.

How barren every aprioristic view of religion has been, history well attests. It has never been anything but a parasitic growth. To a limited number of people in academic cir-

cles it has always appealed, and will probably continue to do so. Every generation or so it has a temporary revival; the academic mind heaves its Sisyphus stone. But nothing ever comes of it. The quest for a satisfactory abstract religion is as idle as the attempt to invent a perpetual-motion machine. It is necessarily foredoomed to failure. All such religious movements are hopelessly bankrupt before they start. Like the cloud above Niagara, they will probably continually accompany the great historic current of Christian faith. But they will never have any self-sustaining power, — if the testimony of history is to be trusted. In any case, such a conception of religion can never be accepted by the Christian church. In so far, then, as critics have been influenced in their estimate of the Old Testament by this view of religion, their work will have to be purged before it can be made at home in the world of Christian thought.

The rejection of miracles naturally follows from the aprioristic standpoint. From this point of view, a sufficient motive for the miraculous does not exist. But even among those who hold to historic Christianity, there has been a tendency in recent years to give up the belief in physical miracles at least. The special difficulty with miracles of this kind is not logical but psychological. It is due not to thought but to the imagination. As a difficulty of the imagination, however, it is real. And to this is added the fact that the modern religious mind does not feel the necessity of miracles in the same way that men did when the deistic philosophy was dominant. Miracles then seemed the one way of finding God, and the one way in which he could manifest his living presence. Now the natural as well as the miraculous is referred to a divine causality. God is to be seen in the ordinary ongoings of nature as well as in the marvelous. Hence there is a tendency

to reject physical miracles altogether, not as impossible, but as superfluous. For the only essential thing, it is thought, in religious history, is the presence of God. And this may have manifested itself without miracle.

The older rationalists treated the biblical miracles as simply exaggerations of natural events. Since the time of De Wette it has been customary in critical circles to look upon them as myths. This view, when taken universally, has naturally not commended itself to Christian thought. Hence to meet the case of such believers as find it difficult to accept miracles of any kind, it has been pointed out that the sense test is not the sole mark of objective reality. "There might be a spiritual awareness of reality beyond sense which should be a revelation that could never be judged, or tested by sense. . . . And if there were such awareness beyond sense, it could be described only in sense terms, and would thus be liable to misunderstanding." Physical miracles then — at least some of them — might be viewed as sense expressions, of actual spiritual experiences; and thus their objective religious content, which is the only important thing in any of them, would be preserved. This theory may perhaps be the correct explanation of such miraculous narratives as those of the resurrection.

But the surrender, not to say open rejection, of all physical miracles, is of very doubtful apologetic value. The reasons or causes that lie back of it are in most cases mixed. Obsolete notions of a mechanism of nature, and psychological influences of a dubious character, mingle with more or less of genuine Christian thought and sentiment. But the latter is seldom, if ever, the decisive factor. Then, too, the rejection of miracle in the material world leads easily to the rejection of miracle in the world of spirit. And to take this latter position is to deprive

Christianity of its distinctive character. The Christ of faith gives way to the "Jesus of history." And this "Jesus of history," aside from being a fiction of the modern critic, is of relatively slight religious value. The church was founded upon the Christ of faith, and will hardly be able to exist apart from him. Those who put in his place the so-called "historical Jesus," are forced to admit that, thus far, the Christian faith has been propagated chiefly by means of illusion and error; and that the truth about Jesus has succeeded in making relatively small headway. Whether a truth so impotent as this is really truth, is a question which the native pragmatism of the human mind naturally raises, and usually has little difficulty in answering. But, however this may be, the incarnation of the Son of God is the central teaching of Christianity, and in any sense that gives to it a real significance this teaching involves a stupendous miracle. If it is accepted, the question of biblical miracles in general is set in a new light. It is then seen that these miracles — in part at least — fit in with the Christian view of a divine revelation of grace, and form worthy factors of it. And "this system," as Professor Bowne says, "with its past history and future outlook is its own proof. Whatever dogmatism may say, science has no objection to it. Historical investigation will never do away with it. And so long as it proves itself the power of God unto salvation, men will believe it — miracles and all. It will never long be recommended to faith by diminishing its miraculous character, for when it comes to believing, we insist on believing something worth while. There is no attraction in a minimum of belief, providing the belief be really worth believing."

As a result of adopting this distinctively Christian standpoint, we do not feel constrained to accept any particular Old Testament miracle. We feel perfectly free as over against

them all. But we do object to a dogmatic rejection of them. Miracles, it is true, do not have for us the significance they once had. The old antithesis between the natural and the divine has given way to the doctrine of the divine immanence. Revealed religion consequently does not stand so sharply opposed to natural religion as was formerly the case. But it does not follow from this that the old distinction between the sacred and the profane has been altogether obliterated, and that no special and unique character belongs to biblical history. Theistic, not to say Christian, thought requires us to hold that there are different degrees of divine nearness. God is not present everywhere, among all peoples, in the same sense and to the same degree. He came nearer to Israel than to other nations; and, if so, it is possible that miracles formed a part of that nearer approach. Anyhow, such is Christian belief. And from this point of view the work of Old Testament criticism must be revised and carried on, if it is to be fully naturalized in the Christian church.

ARTICLE II.

THE BEARING OF ONE'S PHILOSOPHY ON ONE'S CREED.

BY THE REVEREND ROBERT E. NEIGHBOR, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

PHILOSOPHY — if a true philosophy — may be defined as the rational explanation of the world. It aims to create a “universe.” That is to say, it aims to reduce heterogeneousness to homogeneity, to find for each isolated fact its proper relation to all other facts, to explain why it is, how it is, and whence it is, and thus to constitute a “system of things” co-ordinated through all its parts by law and dominated by intelligent purpose. The quest and goal of philosophy is unity. And unity means the presidency of Mind.

Philosophy interprets but it does not discover. And in fulfilling its function as an interpreter it balks at nothing. It both scales the heavens and “dives into the wells of Death.” It seeks to know God and spirit as well as things purely physical and material. It aims to render such account of them to the reason as it can, and to determine their relations to whatever else is. Philosophy in this way becomes also a Theology.

“Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies;
I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower — but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is.”

One of the old thinkers used to say that “man is the meas-

ure of his universe" — and the saying is true. The remark of Sir William Hamilton is equally true, that no problem ever emerges in theology which has not previously arisen in philosophy. Thus closely related is one's theology to one's philosophy; in truth, the theology is dependent on the philosophy. Error in the latter will run out into the former, and you can tell what a man's theology is likely to be as soon as you know his philosophy. Doubtless one's creed will react on one's general system of thought, but the measure of its power in modifying that system of thought will not compare with the influence the latter will have upon his scientific formulation of the problems of religion and his interpretation of the Scriptures. For always the greater includes the less and dominates it; and theology is, after all, only a part of the wider and all-inclusive domain of philosophy.

To put the matter in another way: Every man has his own mental bias or personal point of view. No two men see the same thing in precisely the same aspects — nor can they, until they each occupy the other's place. Every man contributes something of himself to his interpretation of whatever problem is presented to him, whether it be one of science or religion. He who looks out on nature through green spectacles sees everything green; the wearer of blue spectacles, on the other hand, sees the same things blue. This is inevitable, and, unfortunately or otherwise, we are all the wearers of spectacles.

What then is the bearing of these facts on the making of creeds? How far has theology actually been influenced by philosophical prepossessions? To what extent has a previously acquired mental bias determined the quality or character of our New Testament interpretations? Far more, I am persuaded, than we are usually willing to admit. For it is never

either an easy or a grateful task to eliminate ourselves or to dispossess ourselves of our prepossessions. That means loss, and we are afraid that the gain perchance to come — and perchance *not*, as it may at first seem to us — will not compensate for the loss sustained. “The bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.”

The apostles and evangelists of the first century did not theologize. They were preëminently preachers — missionaries, evangelists, men who carried and proclaimed the “evangel.” But when they went forth on this mission the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies were already in control of the human mind in all the educational centers on both sides of the Mediterranean; and, sooner or later, Reason was bound to demand of “Faith” that it justify itself to the understanding. The needs of the soul led captive to the feet of Christ, as the only Saviour, some of the greatest men of the age — men brought up in the atmosphere of the Greek schools; and when these men began to coördinate into a system the scattered truths of the New Testament and to analyze their own religious experiences, and thus to construct a scientific theology, — when they sought to define and fix the place of each truth relatively to all other truth, — it was inevitable that they should have been influenced, in some degree, by those philosophical systems which they had already derived from the schools of Alexandria, Athens, and Rome.

To what extent were they thus influenced? And to what extent, also, has been similarly influenced the thought of those who in succeeding centuries shaped the creeds of the church?

It is much easier to read our philosophical prepossessions into the Bible than it is to read our theology out of it, and there is too much ground for the complaint of the great theologian whom Sir William Hamilton quotes:—

"Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua."¹

As a consequence, the sacred pages carry too frequently the finger-marks of pagan metaphysics and mediæval scholasticism. The creeds of Christendom are impregnated, more or less, with the musty odors of the cloister. We all know that the schoolmen of the Middle Ages were dominated by Aristotle. "The Stagyrte" was the real master of the *thought* of the church. Platonism had much to do with the shaping of the doctrines of Christianity during the first three centuries. In fact, Neoplatonism was a deliberate attempt, on the part of the early church fathers, to harmonize Plato and Christ. The greatest of them all acquired both his mental discipline and his metaphysical opinions from the greatest of the pagan philosophers. As things were, it was perhaps impossible but that the influence of these modes of thought and these philosophical conceptions should, to some extent, although unconsciously, affect the scientific exposition of Christian doctrine; and so it is scarcely too much to say that our formulated expressions of New Testament truths were cast in the molds of a non-Christian speculation.

For example, the difference between the Latin and Greek theologies cannot be fully accounted for, unless note be taken of the difference, in structure, between the Western and Eastern minds, and by remembering also that this difference was determined in large measure by the difference in the philosophical environments of each. Each breathed a different intellectual atmosphere, and moved in a world of different philosophical ideas.

No one has ever questioned the thoroughgoing orthodoxy of Dr. Shedd; yet he acknowledges the facts to which I am

¹ Lect. xv.

referring. In the chapter on "Philosophical Influences in the Ancient Church," which occurs in his "History of Doctrine," he speaks thus: "We shall see that Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero exerted more influence than all other philosophical minds united, upon the greatest of the Christian Fathers, upon the greatest of the Schoolmen, and upon the theologians of the Reformation — Calvin and Melancthon. And if we look at European philosophy, as it has been unfolded in England, Germany, and France, we shall perceive that all the modern theistic schools have discussed the standing problems of human reason, in very much the same manner as Plato and Aristotle discussed them twenty-two centuries ago." ¹

This is certainly quite an admission. But he continues: "The synthesis and poetry of Plato . . . at one extreme, become Gnosticism, while the analysis and logic of Aristotle, at the other extreme, become extravagant subtlety and minute Scholasticism. . . . In this way, Platonism, under the treatment of the New Platonics, degenerated into an imaginative theosophy; and Aristotelianism, in the handling of the later Schoolmen became mere hair-splitting — both systems, in this way, each in its turn, *contributing to the corruption of Christianity.*" ²

And yet again: "The Augustinian view of the origin and nature of sin is closely connected with the Platonic view of the nature and endowments of the human soul. The doctrine of innate ideas harmonizes with that of innate depravity. In the other great controversy of this period, — that respecting the Trinity, — those theologians who exerted the most influence in forming and establishing the final creed-statement, had been disciplined by the Greek intellectual methods. Athanasius, Basil, and the two Gregorys, were themselves of Greek

¹ Book i. chap. i. p. 52.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 59, 60.

extraction, and their highly metaphysical intellects had been trained in Grecian schools." ¹

Thus, besides the general statement first quoted, so eminent a writer and profound a theologian as Professor Shedd acknowledges that important doctrines — such as those of the origin and nature of sin, as held by Augustine; the doctrines of depravity and the Trinity, as they stand in the final creed statements — were shaped under the influence of those metaphysical prepossessions of the great fathers of the church which they had acquired in the schools of their time, and that their interpretation of Scripture was biased thereby. It was not strange that this was so; rather it would have been strange if it had been otherwise. But it should help us in estimating the true value of our traditional theologies, and save us from the mistake of identifying them with the very truth itself. They may be valued, and valued highly, as the mile-stones which mark the progress made in biblical interpretation; but they ought never to be regarded as hitching-posts where we tie up our horses, content at that particular point to terminate our journey.

The illustrations given above might be added to, if it were necessary. It could be shown that other great doctrines of the church, such as that of the Atonement, as elaborated by Anselm, in his "*Cur Deus Homo?*" (which Professor Denny says is the greatest work ever written on that subject), and by Grotius, carry, more or less definitely, the impression of their philosophical theories and speculations. But I forbear — after a single additional reference. A theological writer is condemning the dogma that humanity had an eternal existence in Christ, and that in him it was eternally beloved, elected, and redeemed; and he does so, in part, on the ground

¹ *History of Doctrine*, bk. i. chap. i. p. 70.

that (as he says) this dogma was "rooted in a philosophical speculation — the Platonic system of ideas," which he regards as wholly false, and subversive of both the moral government of God and the gospel of Christ.

It is almost necessarily a baneful thing to attempt to force the great living, regnant truths of Scripture into purely metaphysical molds, forgetting the life and energy that are in the Scriptures as they stand, and treating the evangel of Jesus Christ as though it were primarily a philosophy, instead of the manifestation of a divine Life in human history and the introduction of a new spiritual force into the world. "Spiritual truth," says the author of "The Light and Life of Men," "bearing as it does chiefly on the conscience and moral nature of man, is among the last things on which the terms and laws of formal logic can be tried with safety"; and he adds, with reference to the danger of doing this, that "those who have been trained from infancy in a theological system not only may easily read the New Testament in accordance with it, but they may find it nearly impossible, without long and hard effort, to accept any other interpretation. This is too frequently the effect of those arbitrary, technical definitions of Scripture terms which have been so largely introduced into a region where, of all others, it is vitally important that the mind should be preserved perfectly free and unbiased." The same remark would, of course, apply as well to a philosophical as to a theological system.

We ought never to become guilty of the error of confounding philosophy with life, or of allowing the former to obscure the latter while professing to be its exponent. Care needs to be taken lest a truth get hidden under the law of its coördination and exposition. A scientific statement — or what passes as such — is not necessarily the truth. A definition of

a truth is, possibly, not exactly the truth itself: it is only its attempted explanation — the truth *as it seems to us*. “The truth as it is *in Jesus*” is not necessarily the truth as it is in John Calvin or Martin Luther, in John Wesley or Roger Williams, or any other great leader of the church. Nevertheless, the formulations of men have not seldom been accepted for the very truth itself; and our creeds have, in our intellectual conceitedness and self-sufficiency, been labeled with that sacred title, and sometimes forced on the acceptance of men under threat of eternal perdition or of ecclesiastical disability. But these creeds have, in fact, been nothing more than the expression of what certain scholarly men, with all their philosophical prepossessions clinging to them, have conceived the truth to be. The language in which their conceptions have been cast is metaphysical and, in this respect, far enough removed from the language of the Scripture. The Athanasian formula may be referred to as an instance of this. The metaphysical relation expressed in the Latin term *persona* and the Greek term *hypostasis*, and the distinctions between *homo-* and *homoi-ousios* as applied to the mode of the divine existence as a Trinity, are such as make it doubtful whether all of the bishops of the Council did themselves clearly understand, and which certainly the common people could not be expected to, but which all the same they were required to believe or — as care was taken to affirm — “without doubt perish everlastingly.” Thus for ages — aye, even down to our own times — eternal life was made to depend upon a piece of abstruse metaphysical theology which, in fact, had usurped the place of the truth it professed to define and to defend. But “the truth” is not any series of dogmatic propositions, and never was or will be: it is the living, personal Christ himself, who lives and reigns in the affections, and controls the conduct, of those

who love him ; for men are not saved by their intellectual opinions, but by their personal attitude to the personal Christ. This is by no means to say that what opinions one may entertain, what one "believes," is a matter of no consequence ; it only affirms that the one is not to be made a substitute for the other.

The philosophical doctrine of Dualism which has had general acceptance in these modern times was recently challenged by the distinguished president of a theological seminary, who in a series of scholarly papers advocated (or seemed to advocate) the theory of Monism. Monism argues that there is no essential distinction between matter and spirit — that both have their unity in God, who created them both. What "matter" really *is*, and what "spirit" *is*, who knows? Is God the synthesis of his universe? Are the Creator and his creation, in the last analysis, one and the same? Do all things "consist" in him? The Bible tells us that God is Spirit, and it everywhere differentiates him from his creative work. Our faculties also differentiate them. But are our faculties infallible? They do not always penetrate to the core of the problem. Monism seems to lead us directly toward Pantheism: it makes the Creator and the creature one. Therefore a distinguished theological professor immediately assailed the argumentation of the president in favor of the current dualistic conception. But we all knew that the president was no more a pantheist than was the professor. The incident of this controversy is called up here only to show how inevitably philosophy connects itself with theology, and how it must necessarily modify theological opinion.

In view, then, of these facts and their implications, what are we to do? Shall we cast aside our creeds as worthless? Shall we wholly distrust our reasoning powers, and no longer

reason at all? Surely we ought to do some honest thinking; and every man who thinks will have his creed. The danger of a creed lies in its becoming either a fetter to intellectual activity or a temptation to intellectual duplicity, whereas it ought to be simply a register of intellectual progress. I pity the man of middle age who has not outgrown the creed of his youth, and who will not also change his present creed before he reaches his life's end. The man who has no creed is an imbecile; the man who ties himself up to a creed is a supernumerary. But in answering the question as to what we should do in view of the facts set out in this paper, it seems to me that we shall be constrained in the direction of four things:—

1. Of *tolerance*. No one has yet seen Truth in all its fair proportions and in all the beautiful symmetry of its parts. We have not yet seen Truth as it is. Much less have we come into the full possession of it. Truth is a continent the bounds of which lie far beyond the limits of the few acres we call our own. Perhaps our neighbor's acreage is as good soil as ours, and may have as fair an aspect toward the sun; and if, perchance, some of his vines run over on to our ground, or our vines on to his, we need not become angry about it—nor need we even be surprised. It is a way vines have—if they have any life in them.

2. Of *open-mindedness*. The exhortation to be “given to hospitality” should also be held to include hospitality to new truth—or truth that is new to us. The new opinion that comes knocking at one's door may, for all one knows at first, prove to be “an angel unawares”; therefore let not the door be slammed in its face, but at least let the stranger tarry long enough for us to become sure of his identity and to find out whether or not he have a message for us from the King. For.

for some reason, Truth comes often in strange disguise and not with its name conspicuously written on its forehead. It was not expected that the Messiah would come to Bethlehem as a babe; and when he came there was "no room for him in the inn," which was found to be already crowded with guests. It is much the same with our intellectual prepossessions, which too frequently crowd out the truth which is seeking entertainment at our hands. Children are the chosen types of the Kingdom of Heaven, and it is the happy condition of childhood, standing as it does at the threshold of Knowledge, to be open-minded towards it, whereas we who are older must needs often retrace our steps and divest ourselves of much that we have acquired and have prized. But this is always difficult, and to some men impossible. Luther did not settle everything; John Calvin did not explore the entire territory of divine revelation; and even we ourselves may have yet some things to learn and some to let go of, if we can only become sufficiently childlike and teachable. We have not yet done with the shaping of creeds.

3. *Of constant appeal to the New Testament.* The watchword must ever be: "Back to the Book!" With all the earnestness I possess, and in behalf of every real interest of the Kingdom of God, would I urge a painstaking, reverent, and open-minded study of the New Testament at first hand. The important thing — and indeed the vital thing — after all is this: What did the Master say? and not what did the Church Fathers, or John Calvin, or the Westminster divines, or John Wesley, or anybody else, say? Otherwise we become guilty of the fault Christ condemned, namely, that of "making the Word of God of none effect by our tradition." Our effort should be, as we turn the pages of the most wonderful Book that was ever written, to divest ourselves of all our prepos-

sessions, no matter from whom derived, and in the simplicity of little children to let the Master himself speak to us from its pages. It is hoped and believed that the greatest of Teachers will condescend to speak to us if only we are in the listening attitude.

4. Of *insistence upon the fact, already suggested, that we are not saved by our theological opinions but by our personal attitude to the personal Christ*. It is Christ who is "the Truth" — as he himself said; and to be in a friendly relation to him, to love him, and to be ready always to do his will — this is the main condition of understanding him, and therefore of knowing the Truth. And to know him and, through him, the Father who sent him, is the eternal life (John xvii. 3). It must become with us, in our attitude to Christ, as Longfellow pictures the attitude of Agassiz toward Nature. In beautifully simple lines he tells of the great physicist's childlike, open-minded receptivity to Nature as his teacher, which also was the condition of her teaching him:—

"And Nature, the old nurse, took
The child upon her knee,
Saying: 'Here is a story-book
Thy Father has written for thee!"

"'Come, wander with me,' she said,
'Into regions yet untrod;
And read what is still unread
In the manuscripts of God.'

"And he wandered away and away
With Nature, the dear old nurse,
Who sang to him night and day,
The rhymes of the universe.

"And whenever the way seemed long.
Or his heart began to fail,
She would sing a more wonderful song,
Or tell a more marvellous tale."

In these lines let us, for Nature, substitute Christ — or the New Testament as the record of his word and will — and the verses will as fittingly indicate what our relation to him must be if we are to know him and to understand him, and if we are to advance, from year to year, in this knowledge and understanding.

ARTICLE III.

SOCIAL OR INDIVIDUAL REGENERATION?

BY ARNOLD V. C. P. HUIZINGA, WEST NEWTON, MASS.

RECENTLY Bernard Shaw declared: "Christ is a failure, and God has been kicked out of the back-window in our modern age." This blasphemous utterance was designed to startle the audience, and perhaps did not fail of its effect. However, in recent ministerial conferences, it has become quite plain that the prevailing sentiment among the younger ministers tends to consider the ministry exclusively as a call to social service. We need to-day a social gospel. The ministry of the 'Word' must be supplanted by a ministry to human needs and life. Whatever Christianity may have done in the past, it surely is not available for the needs of our present social conditions. Theology now must yield to sociology, even in parish and pulpit. Social democracy, Christian socialism, if you will, is the workingman's religion, and rapidly coming to be recognized as the only kind of religion worth having. It 'does' things, it struggles for the right of one's fellow-men. It, indeed, beholds a brother when naked and hungry, to clothe and feed him. The 'social gospel' of to-day enlarges its scope into all the activities of life. The Y. M. C. A.'s, the social settlements, clubs, and philanthropic endeavors of all sorts figure as prominently as the church, and maintain the standing of the church. Preaching and teaching of Christian truth is futile under the adverse conditions of congested centers; nay, the proclamation of the old gospel is out of place in the hard, sordid struggles of 'life as it is.' Chris-

tianity does not save under such conditions; and so the modern minister has come to see that he must strike at those 'conditions.' Improve conditions if you wish to improve society, for improved conditions will produce better men. The pet word of evolutionary teachings, 'environment,' has become the basis of the new philosophy, which is to displace—

"The old American Idee
To make a man a man, and let him be."

It matters little that evolutionary philosophers subsequently affirmed that 'environment' should not be employed as a leading factor in the much-vaunted modern *Weltanschauung*. The movement which social reformers built on it is beyond their control. The declaration of the bankruptcy of Christianity, whether in the blasphemy of Bernard Shaw and his socialist *confrères*, or in the more sinister facts of a socialized gospel, as many modern pastors seem to understand their calling, leaves us to work upon society through social endeavors. Thus, instead of christianizing society with the gospel of Christ, Christianity is to be socialized,—secularized, if you will. External efforts in the betterment of social conditions constitute the social gospel for to-day. That 'environment' supplies really only the *means* for individual and social development, as the individual avails himself of the materials which the social *milieu* offers, or indeed fails to do so, does not occur to the modern dogmatist. For these socialized modernists the environment, the conditions, are basal facts: they hold the key to all improvement and are the leverage for economic and moral progress. Moral progress, in fact, is only a finer form of economic progress. In stating the situation thus plainly we may facilitate the discussion of the principles underlying the spiritual interpretation of life, which raises the soul-

concern as all-important, and the view which sees behind the individual the conditions, the environment, the social matrix, from which the individual emerges, with all his merits or demerits.

It is quite natural that the socialists, in their struggle for improved social conditions, should carry to its extreme the emphasis upon conditions as primary in life; but it is less reasonable to see ministers of the gospel espouse this doctrine, and give their pulpits up to labor questions and social problems as such. Many of the younger clergymen, schooled in seminaries that were socialized in proportion as their dethologizing had set in, have, open-eyed, accepted socialism as the modern gospel. Others harbor the hopeless illusion that Christianity and socialism should go together, deceiving themselves with the superficial explanation that Christianity should manifest itself in social activities of good-will, and socialism should endeavor to establish civic righteousness in a Christian spirit. What, then, is there incompatible between the two standpoints? why can one not be a 'Christian socialist'? Simply, because the Christian believes, on the high authority of his Master, that "man shall not live by bread alone." The socialist, however, fights only for bread and butter, for better economic conditions. It is difficult to see why or how such a fight for bread and butter can properly be called Christian. On the contrary, so far forth as adhesion is given to the thoroughly materialistic doctrine of socialism, which diverts all interests from the individual soul, on which Christianity centers primarily its attention, precisely so much is thereby detracted from Christianity.

The message and function of the church is a spiritual one. Sin, the fundamental problem of all ages, is to be overcome by the gracious indwelling of Christ in the hearts of regen-

erate humanity. Christianity aims at better men, socialism at better conditions. They are, therefore, diametrically opposed to each other, both in motive and in spirit. It should not be necessary; but in order to avoid misinterpretation, it may be observed here, that Christianity is of course never unmindful of conditions, but believes that they are created and controlled by man, and that they, as representing human achievement, may be the means of success in human progress. Similarly, socialism is not indifferent to man, but believes that, as he is the creature of circumstances and controlled by his conditions, he will improve as external circumstances improve. The criterion with the Christian is within man; for the socialist, the standard and source of human civilization is without. Now, to proclaim man the product and mere reflection of his social surroundings is to insult the moral sense of even the most depraved. The bold assumption which reduces human civilization to an epi-phenomenon of the natural, makes the 'social milieu' not only formative elements in, but productive of character, and dispenses by so doing with all morality and progress. There can be no struggle for the right when man is borne along on the tide as he happened to arrive upon the shores of time, fatally bound to the condition and the hour. And as to progress, it is hard to conceive of any, thus shut up in the mechanical circle of conditions without motive or standard.

It is time to raise an emphatic protest against socialism, which is death to the individual, conscience, and all progress. Indeed, instead of seeing conditions *behind* the individual, we see the individual placed *in the midst* of conditions. We see the individual struggle with these conditions, modify them, and replace them by others. We often see favorable conditions used for hurt, and bad conditions for good. Is there not

a saying: "Give man a paradise, and he will turn it into a desert, while he will strive to convert the desert into a garden"? Oscar Wilde voices in "De Profundis" the sad experience that, in common with many of his age, he had used the good things of life for his own harm, whilst he won good from the hard experiences of his life. In fact, it is a patent absurdity to maintain that a man's character is made or unmade mechanically by good or bad 'conditions.' Can the most favorable circumstances ever guarantee a man's best development? Do bad conditions hopelessly doom to the production of bad characters? They may give color and form to the development, but never determine mechanically a man's moral flavor.

Man does not merely passively react upon these original, all-important conditions of society; he is responsible for them, he made them, he can change them. He is not the slave of them, and — be they good or bad — himself being the main factor, he appropriates or rejects of their material according to his nature. Selective thinking and the increasing emphasis on the volitional part of man's nature is meaningless jargon, if the socialist's contention be true. But a good man does face bad conditions to grapple with them, often rising superior to them, while a bad man in good external conditions works the quicker his own undoing. It is then, *in* man, not without, that his essential destiny is wrought out, and by himself, not by 'conditions.'

So far from 'conditions' constructing human civilization, projecting it as it were into the individuals, Professor Perry says well: "The external environment of life is in some respects favorable, in other respects unfavorable. Now, strangely enough, it is the unfavorable rather than the favorable aspect of the environment that conduces to progress. Progress, or

even the least good, would, of course, be impossible, unless the mechanical environment was morally plastic. The fact that nature submits to the organization which we call life is a fundamental and constant condition of all civilization. But there is nothing in the mere compliance of nature to press life forward. It is the menace of nature which stimulates progress. It is because nature always remains a source of difficulty and danger that life is provoked to renew the war and achieve a more thorough conquest. Nature will not permit life to keep what it has unless it gains more." ¹

How true this remark is, becomes evident as soon as we analyze these finalities of socialistic theories, the conditions, the system. Good or bad, are they not all man-made? Is not every "milieu" charged with human effort, and subject to human influence? Could man then be so hopelessly subject to the work of his own efforts, good or bad?

Yet, in what fatalistic strain writes the *Boston American* of August 3, 1911, in an editorial on the appointment of four judges! "The four judges whom the Governor has appointed are four good men to-day. What they will be to-morrow, no man knows. They go into a different environment and will lead a different kind of business life. What effect these changes will have upon them only time can tell. Ratigan, Keating, and Dubuque are men of character and ability and good lawyers. Walter Perley Hall has been tried satisfactorily in public office."

It is, of course, conceivable that single individuals may fail in surroundings capable of subduing them. Virtue is not always triumphant in this sublunary sphere. But to treat moral integrity as is done here, is certainly to despair of all goodness, also of that of 'environment.' For soon these same

¹ *The Moral Economy*, p. 180.

men will either call upon virtuous men to bring about or to maintain civic righteousness, after having declared virtue fictitious. And thus it is that socialism confronts us with the amazingly stultifying fact to make its appeal in behalf of the individual whom it ignores, and to fight for civic righteousness, the existence of which it denies and freely disregards. While making its plea for human love the socialist fans class-hatred. He denounces greed, and contends for material gain as the only value of life.

Surely, with the French essayist Montaigne, we realize that "everyone must have 'an inner touchstone' [*un patron au dedans*] by which to judge his actions." Man is a responsible being, and at least the law will hold him accountable. The ethical life assures us that conscience is a mighty fact, not to be discarded by theories. God left his witness in the human heart. None can disobey His mandate with impunity. Each individual faces the issues of life singly and incurs personal responsibility. If life is our own in the last instance, we cannot live it by proxy, cannot resolve it into a mere component part of social life, cannot make it the outcome of 'conditions.' The pinch of individuality is with us, and with the "I" goes a conscience which is more than a social verdict. It is something which concerns me directly, to which I must make a personal response, and thus incur responsibility.

Maurice in his "Lectures on Casuistry" calls attention to the fact that, in behalf of ethical and religious improvement, appeals are made to public opinion to enforce the claims of the individual conscience on the one hand, and on the other to the individual conscience to bear up public opinion; showing thus that the point of leverage is with the individual, embodied in social ethics. All endeavors to make conscience a resulting inner response to external environment, whether in

social interpretation, or legal explanation, or evolutionary analysis, fail to account for its authoritative, apodictic commands. Conscience neither seeks its authority from the things of the world, nor endeavors to justify its laws by them. For one surely does not reason one's self into an obligation which requires sacrifice even unto death. To be sure, the actual ethical responses are considered primarily, or at least mainly, emotional; but this does not account for the strong sentiment of the objectiveness of obligation, and sanction of duty and ought. But more than this, the social self is always transcended by the ideal self.

As Professor Baldwin remarks: "The social influence which determines the development of conscience almost entirely in its earlier stages is itself transcended, in the rational or self-conscious organization of the moral life; so that the conscience becomes not merely a social self, but an ideal self."

Thus Professor Ormond observes in "Foundations of Knowledge": "We are obliged to trace the primary root of the sense of kind to the self in some primary, individual nature, that in becoming internally conscious becomes also the 'fontal type' of all ends which it seeks objectively." "The reaction of the subject-consciousness is a reaction as a whole, and self-apprehension will be a function of this mode of reaction. If we are sure of our self-activity, we have that assurance because we grasp it in an act of immediate intuition. It cannot be disputed, then, that we know the fact of our self-activity. . . . If in the reactive consciousness, self-activity, and not simply activity that has no label, is revealed, then it is clear that we have a qualification of the content as a whole which renders it not merely a 'that,' but a 'what.' The fact that the activity is taking the form of a self shows that it is not formless, but defining itself as a whole."

Similarly, Fouillée remarks in his "Psychologie des peuples européens": "M. Guyau and M. Tarde have strongly insisted that we are under the dominion of continual suggestion, coming from the environment in which we live. . . . We disagree with those who reduce the whole of sociology to a study of these forms, and we believe that the study of its psychological foundation is essential to sociology."

This fact is also clearly brought out in an able essay, in the *American Journal of Sociology*, by Dr. Philip Fogel, who insisted, against Professor Giddings's denial of the same, that there is plainly a metaphysical element involved in sociological studies. The worth of and the authority for the individual agent is assumed to be derived from and sustained by the community in the evolutionary theories, though it is admitted that "natural selection" has been overemphasized in its dual operation with "the struggle for existence" or "adaptation to environment" to bring about "the survival of the fittest."

How are these functions related? How does the struggling individual find his place in this unfinished world, according to the plan of the whole which it is to body forth? Is it to be computed, or is the world's explanation to be apprehended only by faith? Spencer's evolutionary definition of conscience as being "the control of the less evolved feelings by the more evolved ones" projects from without those principles that we must find within. Moreover, the decision as to which is the more evolved feeling is to be made by this individual, who is left reacting rather than acting. We have on all sides primarily the subjective reference, for the moral and religious life announces itself as a private and individual experience. It is plain, then, that in philosophical, ethical, and religious questions, we are thrown back on the individual, as our starting-point. And the main objection against sociological the-

ories such as imitation, consciousness of kind, social forms as suggestion, and different evolutionary theories, is that the initiative and interpretation is always without. Conscience, as the basis of moral and religious life, may be ruled by law, but is not produced by it. A law-abiding citizen may be of flavorless morality. This appeal to the personal consciousness is always assumed in the practice of life.

The late Governor Hughes of New York put this impressively when he said: "I do not sympathize very much with schemes of moral regeneration through legislation. We can accomplish a great deal by wise laws, but the impetus of moral movements must as a rule be given by the voluntary work of citizens who, with the force of conviction, press their views upon the people and secure that public sentiment according to which alone any true moral reform can be accomplished. I also have very little sympathy for an ambitious scheme for doing away with all evil in the community at once."

This additional remark of Hughes is so significant in its practical bearings that we make an observation regarding it with reference to American conditions. The actual morality of a community, affected in its usual way by influences within its social life and from without, does not materially change from day to day. Moral progress being as slow as it is desirable, within a given time the morality of a society and its citizens remains practically the same, and with this more or less constant quantity of moral flavor its corresponding conditions are maintained. This fact is sadly overlooked by that zeal without knowledge which often starts crusades, campaigns, and agitations calling upon the devices of law to do away with the evils of society which offend the moral sense. These impatient and cheap emotional reformers have often

forced laws upon communities with the plain result that they were broken and evaded; or, if successfully maintained, they drove the evils into other channels, or spread them so as to escape observation. The real reformer reforms within. Christ thus remakes a sin-stricken race. Moral education is harder than external moral discipline, but it touches the main-spring of human progress, and therefore deserves the enthusiasm of these reformers rather than the restraining agency of the law.

Water does not rise higher than its own level. This impulsive legalism is therefore not only wrong on the strength that the evils of a given society cannot be mechanically removed by enforcing strict laws which would rule them out, but especially since no society furnishes material to apply rigorously those laws which are for its average member too high to attain unto. Thus the law itself becomes a farce, because it has to fall back upon personal application for efficiency. This is even more true in regard to the more serious ailment of society, prevailing greed and dishonesty, than it is concerning the much-talked-about forms of vice.

All schemes of reform are necessarily wrecked upon mercenary officials. And these presuppose of course a prevailing practice of dishonesty, since an honest community as necessarily disposes of a mercenary official, as a dishonest community corrupts or displaces the honest one. What, then, avail laws for safety, purity of food, hygiene, education, etc., if inspectors and supervisors are being bought! It requires the force of moral fiber in the community to enforce moral laws, not the temporary excitement of good-will from otherwise inadequate human nature. Immoral elements can no more stand guard over moral laws than that moral individuals should be called upon to enforce immoral laws or practices.

Of course, in the advocacy of the restraint by law, may be claimed its salutary, educating influence; but this argument, to be valid, presupposes precisely that the law be not too far in advance of the average morality of the community. The common and main assumption, however, in the clamor for laws as cure for social and individual evils, is to treat the positive moral elements of the community as too weak to withstand, to regulate, nay ideally to overcome, the evil in its midst. Thus the positive, regenerating *cure* is abandoned, and resort is taken to restraint, which may beat back evil, but never overcome it. Yet, this negative, outward restraint relies for its efficiency upon a sufficient amount of moral health in the community, which the argument starts out to ignore. In fine, a community whose moral health cannot primarily in some positive way deal with its evils, instead of leaning exclusively on the restraint of law, is doomed, as also this last resort of law-reform is morally bankrupt. It is Voltaire and Frederick the Great again at Sans Souci, strangers to the cause of Christendom, and disbelieving its redeeming power, yet appalled by vice and wickedness whose powers they overrated with the exclamation, "Ecrasez l'infâme!" It is the word of the Frenchman in the grip of sensuality: "Où est la femme? Tuez-la." ('Where is the woman! kill her.') It is the impatient, faithless temper of hysteric revolt against threatening evils whose encroaching powers seem to loom larger than Christ's assuring words teach us: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

This unbelief regarding the influences for good is evident in the argument for a bridled press by Sayons in "*Le XVIII^e siècle a l'étranger*": "Que l'erreur ne fait de mal qu'à celui qui écrit et que la vérité n'a jamais besoin d'être vengée que par elle même, cela est de vérité rigoureuse dans le royaume

abstrait de la raison pure. La question, après tout, est de savoir si les esprits capables d'être subjugués par l'erreur peuvent être ramenés par la vérité qu'ils ne voient point. Or, quand l'erreur est incompatible avec l'existence de la société civile, la société civile fait peut-être bien de ne pas compter sur les rayons de la vérité pour éclairer des aveugles." ('That error does no harm except to him who writes, and that truth needs no defense but that by itself, is strictly true in the abstract realm of pure reason. The question after all is to know whether minds capable of being influenced by error can be brought back by the truth they do not perceive. Now, when error is incompatible with the existence of civil society, civil society perhaps does well not to count on the rays of light from the truth to enlighten the blind.') In thus placing emphasis upon the positive element as the real principle in progressive moral development, we but repeat the view which held of Mosaic legislation that "the Law must be realized in an inner harmony between the heart of the worshipper and Jehovah; it must be accepted, not as a curb or rein, but as the rule of the inner life. Only thus can the heart and the life correspond, and the outward observance be the true index of the inward moral reality. The Law graven on tables of stone is to be written by the spirit on the fleshly tables of the heart."

The scholarly and able New Jersey governor, Woodrow Wilson, in a recent address also emphatically declared that the people ought to be cured of the appetite for laws as the remedy for all ills. Before the American Bar Association at Chattanooga, Tennessee, he said: "The major premise of all Law is moral responsibility, the moral responsibility of individuals for their acts, and no other foundation can any man lay on which a stable fabric of equitable justice may be reared."

The attempts at social betterment address themselves to the individuals as private persons. Those who seek the betterment of society in education, and in improved conditions, tacitly assume that the individual will be first to respond to the aim of ethical and religious effort. On this score, the principle of social settlement is radically false, though it may work some good through inconsistency. One cannot apply to the slum population a law of life taken from artificially transplanted characters who remain as moral leaders still dependent for success on the disposition of those whom they try to improve. The effort to make the display of moral excellence an inducement to improvement on the part of the socially unfortunate is based upon faulty psychological principles. The initiative in moral and religious life must spring from within; in the response of the will we find our obligated responsibility. Both the tempting and the being tempted are factors to be dealt with. But no temptation obtains where individual inclination does not respond to evil surroundings, nor is there aspiration after virtue if the good is not perceived as such.

Thus Mill's argument that it is never a duty to force civilization upon another nation, not willing to receive it, is rendered superfluous. From the nature of the case, this is an impossibility with individuals and nations alike.

This aspect of appropriating the good through our inner desires makes plain that those are most Christ-like characters who like Christ most. "This aspect of Christianity may properly be elevated into a larger significance. We may view Christianity from its inward, positive, dynamic side; Christ at work on the hearts of the believers, as contrasted with its formal, external, its social and historic course. The issue of an inward religion is the burden of the prophets, and always

centers on the personal accountability to a personal God. Every inward revelation bears the stamp of an authority over the world which it entreats to gracious submission to the Creator's will. In the conflict of moral struggles it asserts: 'Be not afraid of their faces, for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord' (Jer. i. 8). 'We must obey God rather than men' (Acts v. 20). The distinguishing characteristic of Christianity is that preceptive, legal, restraining codes are turned into dynamic, positive life-principles. Christ buttresses Christianity. As Paul reiterates with persuasive testimony; Christ lives *in* the Christian and thus makes the church 'a collective Christ.'"¹

It has always been indeed the Christian principle and effort to regenerate and 'improve society through the individual. Thus the leverage of, the principle for, and the approach to moral improvement is within. The spiritual eye of faith discloses the treasure and importance of the individual soul, that it would not profit a man if he should gain the whole world and lose his own soul. One may gage the spiritual tenor of Christian churches and views largely by their realization of this fact. The more environment, external circumstances, social conditions, engross the attention, the less real Christian nurture of the soul, the formation of character after, yea, in, Christ is lost sight of. The popular verdict that an estrangement of the church's true function to preach the gospel and minister to Christian nurture leads to socialism is only too true. Utilitarian efforts always affect preferably the material surroundings, where effects show more readily than in the spiritual realm. Its mechanical notions find encouragement in the world of visible things in tangible results, while patient devotion to spiritual interests often severely strains the faith

¹The author's Belief in a Personal God.

of the average believer. This attitude of mind is fostered by an unprecedented industrial development and material prosperity in recent years.

But in 1829 Rev. Edward Irving writes: "Men are grown mechanical in head and heart, as well as in hand. They have lost faith in individual endeavor, and in natural force, of any kind. Not for internal perfection, but for external combinations and arrangements, for institutions, constitutions — for Mechanism of one sort or other, do they hope and struggle. Their whole efforts, attachments, opinions, turn on mechanism, and are of a mechanical character. This condition of the two great departments of knowledge; the outward, cultivated exclusively on mechanical principles — the inward finally abandoned, because, cultivated on such principles, it is found to yield no result — sufficiently indicates the intellectual bias of our time, its all-pervading disposition towards that line of enquiry. In fact, an inward persuasion has long been diffusing itself, and now and then even comes to utterance, that except the eternal, there are no true sciences; that to the inward world (if there be any) our only conceivable road is through the outward; that, in short, what cannot be investigated and understood mechanically, cannot be investigated and understood at all. [The Scotch divine anticipated here Dubois Reymond's watchword, "Was nicht mechanisch gefasst ist, ist nicht wissenschaftlich verstanden!"]

"Nowhere is the deep, almost exclusive faith, we have in mechanism, more visible than in the Politics of this time. Civil government does, by its nature, include much that is mechanical, and must be treated accordingly. We term it, indeed, in ordinary language, the Machine of Society, and talk of it as the grand working wheel from which all private machines must derive, or to which they must adapt, their move-

ments. Considered merely as a metaphor, all this is well enough; but here, as in so many other cases, the 'foam hardens itself into a shell,' and the shadow we have wantonly evoked stands terrible before us, and will not depart at our bidding. Government includes much also that is not mechanical, and cannot be treated mechanically; of which latter truth, as appears to us, the political speculations and exertions of our time are taking less and less cognizance. It is no longer the moral, religious, spiritual condition of the people that is our concern, but their physical, practical, economical condition, as regulated by public laws. Thus is the Body-politic more than ever worshipped and tended: but the Soul-politic less than ever. Were the laws, the government, in good order, all were well with us; the rest would care for itself. Dissentients from this opinion, expressed or implied, are now rarely to be met with; widely and angrily as men differ in its application, the principle is admitted by all. Contrive the fabric of law aright, and without farther effort on your part, that divine spirit of freedom which all hearts venerate and long for, will of herself come to inhabit it; and under her healing wings every noxious influence will wither, every good and salutary one more and more expand. The domain of Mechanism, meaning thereby political, ecclesiastical, or other outward establishments, — was once considered as embracing, and we are persuaded can at any time embrace, but a limited portion of man's interests, and by no means the highest portion."

"These dark features," he goes on to say, "we are aware, belong more or less to other ages, as well as to ours. This faith in Mechanism, in the all-importance of physical things, is in every age the common refuge of Weakness and blind Discontent. To reform a world, to reform a nation, no wise man will undertake; and all but foolish men know that the

only solid, though a far slower reformation, is what each begins and perfects on himself."

The liberals, who still recognize Christian tradition, begin to see the harmful influence of this 'reformation from without theory,' when their socialist *confrères* act upon it in consistent manner. Thus the *Congregationalist* remarks in regard to socialist propaganda among the immigrant: "His conscience might in many exigencies take the place of his religious beliefs, but the socialist agitator relieves the individual of all responsibility for wrong-doing, laying the blame on society. The thief, the swindler, the counterfeiter, the 'cadet,' the prostitute, are all victims of the 'corrupt system.'"

Professor Wenley, in the *Educational Review* for October, 1907, in an article "Can we stem the Tide?" remarks: "Careful, and even thoughtful, about processes, the democracy omits to understand that the thing to be gained by the process constitutes the essence of the affair. So it stresses every conceivable aid to life, and lets life itself slip. In the effort to govern everything else, the modern man has failed to provide arrangements whereby he may govern himself. If one thing be plainer than another about our trumpeted 'recent' achievements, it is this — they verge on the hopeless bankruptcy in wellnigh everything relating to the elevation of the human spirit."

Professor Munsterberg observes on page 21 of "American Problems": "The whole radicalism of the prohibition movement would not be necessary if there were more training for self-control. To prohibit always means only the removal of the temptation, but what is evidently more important is to remain temperate in the midst of a world of temptation. The rapid growth of divorce, the silly chase for luxury, the rivalry in ostentation and in the gratification of personal desires in a

hundred forms cannot be cured if only one or another temptation is taken out of sight. The improvement must come from within. The fault is in ourselves, in our prejudices, in our training, in our habits, in our fanciful fear of nervousness."

"Better methods," says Professor Peabody, "may simplify the social question, it can be solved by nothing less than better men." Similarly, we may add, upon the stage there is instilled in the minds of thousands, by cheap melodramas, the unnerving conviction that man is merely, and nothing but, the creature of circumstances. With the exception of the customary villain, who is an impersonation of evil, the characters of the modern plays are inevitably urged on to fall, though sometimes with the display of a half-hearted battle against their evil stars. Could not this very seamy side of life, with its baseness, its vice, misfortune, abandonment, and misery, be illumined as the scene where determination for the right resists the onslaught of evil in the struggles of life? Is it not as human to battle for the right as to drift along with the evil currents! Must man's belief in himself be undermined by those who have most trumpeted his greatness?

Dr. Siegmar Schultze, in his dark picture of modern literature, in "*Der Zeitgeist der modernen Litteratur Europas*," makes the significant remark: "In der Philosophie, in der Weltweisheit der Hoch-gebildeten ist freilich der trübe Materialismus im Erlöschen, statt dessen lodert er immer wilder im Reiche der Halbgebildeten und des Volkes. Unsere Zeit sieht die Wahrheit nur in der Wirklichkeit, und so heftet sie den Blick an die Erde. Ihr blödes Auge sieht den Sieg des guten Principis nur im äußerlichen Erfolg, nicht in den innern Gütern, die jener Kampf dem echten Menschen erringen muss." ('In philosophy, as in the worldly wisdom of the educated, the

sad materialism to be sure is diminishing, but it is increasing instead with the half-educated and the people. Our contemporaries see truth only in reality, and thus are earthly-minded. They see the victory of the principle of goodness only in external results, not in the inner good which comes to the real man in the struggle of life.)

Thus, as we inquire into the moral progress of man or of society, we are inevitably led to the individual as a starting-point. And there, in the heart of man, we cannot fail to recognize as its goal the source of all moral goodness and truth. To recognize God in Christ in all things about us, especially in our fellow-creatures, and to live, so to speak, Christ into this world of institutions and men, linking it from the past to a better future, is a Christian's faith. He proclaims this recognition of God's authority over himself and the world an individual act, but knows that, as a man responds to his choices, so is he responsible; and refusal of God's claims spells ruin to individual and society alike. As Professor Bowen declares in his "Lowell Lectures on Metaphysics and Ethical Science": "The civilization which is not based upon Christianity is big with the elements of its own destruction." The gospel, therefore, ever urges, in loving appeal upon man, his soul-concern as his sole concern.

"Know'st thou *Yesterday*, its aim and reason?
Work'st thou well *To-day*, for worthy things?
Then calmly wait the *Morrow's* hidden season,
And fear not thou, what hap' so e'er it brings!"

ARTICLE IV.

THE SCRIPTURAL FOUNDATION FOR CHRISTIAN
UNITY.¹

BY THE REVEREND BURNETT THEO. STAFFORD,
JORDAN, NEW YORK.

ONE morning in the Litchfield parsonage, the voice of Lyman Beecher was heard calling up the stairway: "Say, boys, what is the matter up there?" Thomas answered: "Father! Henry says God couldn't make two hills without a valley between them." Henry's contention was sound. It simply means that God has fixed laws for the construction and government of His universe, and that it is, therefore, an orderly, reasonable, and reliable creation. Of course, this does not mean that for every manifestation of divine power the law is known; but, rather, that the line of action is according to law, and with human progress will be discovered and explained. And this is not all there is to this fundamental matter. A law of matter or spirit discovered to-day, explains the movement of life in its zone of operation during all time and eternity. The scientific man stakes his soul and reputation on this truth.

Because law accurately marks the line of action which God takes to express His thought and emotion, the New Testament doctrine at once comes into clear view, that in the Incarnation He was purposely obedient to the laws of human condition and achievement. The intent and object of the Satanic assault in the wilderness was to persuade Our Lord

¹Read before the Syracuse (New York) Clerical Club on November 6, 1911.

to remove from this position; when defeat came to the tempter he found himself face to face with a moral world of law possessed of orderly strength and durability. Christ often said that the Redemption of the world required that He fulfil all the demands of spiritual law. This was the way of victory for Him over the powers of death and hell. It is the only way of progress and victory, always and everywhere. Bacon puts it this way: "By obedience to the laws of nature and grace, we reap their reward."

Our Lord told the disciples, as they were able to understand, that His gospel was for all the peoples of the world. The complete statement is the Great Commission. This postulated in His mind an organ of expression, for thought and emotion never do work until focalized and extended by organization. This is the way men are reached and society is influenced. Again, His serious concern was that His followers should be perfected in the character originated and sustained by grace. This meant that they were to be under the reign of the law of love, and therefore must live in a mutually helpful relation. This called for organization. From the first of the public ministry, He announced that He would found and organize a Divine Society. There was the clear statement of this intention in the words commending St. Peter for saying that He was "the Christ, the Son of the Living God," manifested in Incarnation for the Redemption of the world. Then He adds: "Upon this rock [or fact] I will build my Church: and the gates of hell [all organized opposition] shall not prevail against it." In addition to making clear His purpose to found and organize the Divine Society, these words make just as clear the foundation truth on which this organization rests and the object for which it exists. The fact is that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt

among us," and that when this truth of the Incarnate God is preached and believed, it results in the salvation of the individual and the social body. People may come together in an organization for religious ends with this truth left out; such a body is a religious association. Neither in the Gospels, the Acts, nor the Epistles is there any direct or remote suggestion that the work of founding the Divine Society was left to the Apostles or any one else.

Indeed, Our Lord speaks of the Divine Society as existing in the early part of His ministry. He enjoins that difficulties between members in the last resort be referred to Her for settlement. This affirms that the Divine Society was in existence to deal with such matters; and certainly any other view emasculates His words of all sense and practical application. The first members were the Apostles. St. Paul makes it clear in 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6, that before the crucifixion this number had increased. The application of this passage to the matter in hand is explained by the fact that in his Epistles he speaks of those in the divine fellowship as *brethren*. He defines them as *saints*, but he uses the other word to designate those who had accepted the common salvation. Speaking of the post-resurrection appearances of Our Lord, he says: "He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve. After that, he was seen of above five hundred *brethren* at once." The Divine Society was in the embryo state; and, like every other embryo, contained all the potencies of all subsequent growth. After the Pentecostal illumination, the involved principles began to unfold in the work of extension. This is the way with all associated progress. The Fathers of the Constitution stated, in that document, principles of whose unfolding they had no idea at all; but all subsequent national growth has been directed by them.

A detailed examination of the Acts and the Epistles would give additional evidence on what has been said. As regards the Acts it will help to clearness to call attention to the fact that in all of the Pentecostal record, there is not found the slightest suggestion that the Divine Society came into existence at that time. It is simply inconceivable that the accurate and painstaking Luke would have omitted all mention of such a momentous event. As the case stands, he does affirm the existence of the Divine Society, because he says that those being saved were added daily to her.

A society, whether of divine or human origin, to do work must have officers. To this requirement Our Lord was obedient. The first order of the Christian ministry was directly and personally originated by Him. The sacred record preserves this great transaction in these definite words: "And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would: and they came unto him. And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach" (St. Mark iii. 13-14). This matter of receiving and exercising authority in the office of sacred things was a most serious concern to the Apostolic men. They were Hebrews in education and sympathy. They understood the terrible divine punishment which came on Korah and Abiram for having attempted to take, in and of themselves, the authority of the Aaronic priesthood. In various ways Our Lord both recognized and sanctioned its sacred and necessary functions. Every error that is now in the world has always been in it doing business. In the early crude state of the Apostles they concluded that they were the source of authority; but Our Lord said to them: "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that you should go and bring forth fruit" (St. John xv. 16). Years after

the Divine Society had spread as far as the Euphrates, the author of Hebrews voices the common conviction that "no man taketh this honor unto himself." St. Paul was charged by Judaizing believers with having inducted himself into the Christian ministry. He acknowledged the seriousness of the accusation, which certainly conveys his thought and feeling on the matter. In reply he affirms, in the clearest and most solemn way, that he was a minister and Apostle of the gospel of the resurrection, not by the will and authority of man, but by that of Jesus Christ. It may be said that he does not give any official record of his ordination, and therefore, . . . and so on. There is no official record in England of the birth of Queen Victoria, but it is tolerably evident that she was born once upon a time. Of that which he did during his three years' seclusion in Arabia, or what was done for him, we do not know anything at all. But we do know that on his return he went up to Jerusalem to visit St. Peter, and he also became acquainted with St. James, the Lord's brother. The influence of the Hebrew tradition was strong with these two Apostles. It was particularly so with St. James, and it is a clear moral certainty, that, had St. Paul's induction into the Christian ministry been invalid, they would not have received him. Nothing of the kind took place. As subsequent events showed, they, with other Apostles, commended him to the churches, and rejoiced in his abundantly successful labors in preaching the gospel to the Gentiles.

This first order of the Christian ministry was perpetuated by itself. The choosing and appointing of a successor to Judas, the *betrayed*, was done by the Apostles, and there is not the first scrap of evidence that others had anything to do with it. The Apostles ordained the men to the other two sacred offices — Deacons and Presbyters. The diaconate

comes last, but in the sacred record is mentioned first. The setting apart of the seven men as deacons was done by the Apostles in the presence of the congregation. The Apostles said: "Look ye out, brethren, from among you seven men of good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." They were chosen and "set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." There does not seem to be any clear statement of when the office of Presbyter came into existence. Certain it is that it came, and that the Apostles ordained men to it. They did this as Overseers or Bishops of the Divine Society. On a missionary journey through Asia Minor, St. Paul and St. Barnabas "ordained them Elders in every Church" (Acts xiv. 23). Evidently both the churches and the Apostles considered this act needful for the completion of the religious organization, and that the latter, as Bishops, were the authorized persons to do the ordaining. After Titus had been consecrated Bishop, St. Paul appointed him to the diocese of Crete to "set in order the things that were [are] wanting, *and appoint elders in every city*" (Titus i. 5). The fifteenth chapter of the Acts makes it just as clear as language can that St. James the Less was Bishop of Jerusalem, and, as such, presided at the council held there. The evidence of the Epistles and the Revelation is to the same effect; so that the sacred record makes it clear that in the Apostolic days the ministry of the Divine Society was threefold — Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons.

The object of this presentation is not to deal largely with the evidence furnished by the leaders of the Divine Society in the Primitive days. The first third of the second century is very close to the Apostolic period. Irenæus of Lyons (136-202) gives the following evidence: "We can enumer-

ate those who were constituted [consecrated] Bishops by the Apostles and the successors of those Bishops to our own time." A little later (150–226) Tertullian summarizes the evidence thus: "As the Church in Smyrna relates Polycarp to have been constituted [consecrated] there by John, as the Church of Rome affirms Clement to have been ordained by Peter, so in like manner the rest of the churches exhibit the records of those whom they have for Bishops, constituted [consecrated] by the Apostles and conveyors of the Apostolic seed to them." To the same definite effect is the evidence of Eusebius, who says, Ignatius was made Bishop of Antioch in 69, having been consecrated by the Apostles.

Any one desiring can have the abundant evidence that this ministry of the New Testament has come to the present day unimpaired in all of the branches of the Apostolic and Catholic Church—the Greek, the Roman, and the Anglican, the Episcopal in the United States. A word of apology would seem to be required on the position of these religious bodies claiming Apostolic succession through what is called the Presbyter-Bishop line. They teach their claims diligently in their literature. To begin with, the term is of recent origin, there being no trace of it in Christian literature till the sixteenth century. It is true that one Coluthus, a presbyter of the diocese of Alexandria, about 324 took upon himself to make other presbyters out of laymen. He was promptly excommunicated, and his candidates were pronounced laymen. It certainly is not an unfair expectation that, in such a serious matter, the general Christian public has the full right to claim that those religious bodies holding and teaching the Presbyter-Bishop explanation of the Christian ministry shall both morally believe it and honestly practise it. It is purely what business men call "good faith." Now, it is a fact well known

and understood that the Congregational teaching and practice is that every body of believers may and should choose and ordain their ministers. These people have never claimed Apostolic succession, and care very little about it. In all of their generations, they have stood staunchly and honestly by their profession. It is just as well known that all the time Congregational ministers are passing into the active service of those religious bodies holding the Presbyter-Bishop theory, and it would seem morally needful, at least, that they be ordained according to its prescribed rules. This is never done, and it is useless to examine religious or any other claims disingenuously made.

Baptism is the initiatory sacrament into the Divine Society. Quite the clearest statement of its spiritual meaning is St. John iii. 1-22. This was made by the Apostle after years of reflection on the teaching of Our Lord concerning it; and, moreover, it sets forth this teaching as it had been received and practised by the Divine Society for more than two generations. Baptism is the outward and visible sign and oath that all of the privileges and obligations of revealed grace are joyfully assumed and will be discharged up to the measure of ability and opportunity. It is, therefore, that in the New Testament the forgiveness of sins is coupled with obedience. This is psychologically true, for certainly there is no room in the soul for the divine approbation until the one great decision has been made and expressed, to be the faithful servant and soldier of Our Lord. In all that He ever said there is no hint, much less positive teaching, that there can be an approved and accepted life outside of incorporation into Him through the Divine Society. The psychological laws involved hold sway in all of the associated relations of men. Sentiment does not make the alien an American citizen:

taking the great oath of allegiance to the Constitution does. Sentiment does not establish the home; taking the marriage vows and the plighting of troth does. Admiration of Our Lord's wonderful words of love does not bring to the soul the liberty and strength of His touch; the irrevocable obedience of the soul expressed and declared as He has appointed, does.

"Now these are the Laws of the Jungle,
And many and mighty are they;
But the head and the hoof of the Law,
And the haunch and the hump, is—OBEY."

One direct object of the Divine Society was the unification of men of every race and clime in a common brotherhood. Another object was their education in the gracious and victorious life. Now, one of the two-sided psychological experiences of men in all associated relations is that they can and do unite on facts, and that they do separate on opinion, or the explanation of the facts. The world was full to superfluity of religious opinion or theology when the Apostles began to extend the gospel of a crucified and risen Saviour. The Jewish teachers had stacks of theology; the Greek philosophers, like their present-day successors, were expert in evolving from their social and religious consciousness a new religion every twenty-four hours. The men of the *cross* followed the true method of the educator teaching successfully chemistry, geology, or any other science, which is to present the facts of the science as the originating source of the desired intellectual unfolding. They preached the redemptive facts of the Incarnate God, and forthwith there came into vigorous life a mighty conviction of brotherhood of all sorts and conditions of men, for mutual, moral benefit and the spiritual conquest of the world. St. Luke, in his record of the

Pentecostal period, speaks of these facts as the Apostles' doctrine, and that in them "the disciples continued steadfastly" (Acts ii. 42). St. Paul affirms them as "the form of sound words" (2 Tim. i. 13). These men wrote in Greek, and used doctrine instead of creed. Some Roman disciples at a later date gave them literary expression, and accordingly used the word "creed." This creed of the Apostles is the New Testament foundation of belief for the unification of God's people. These redemptive facts are "the faith which was once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3), and "other foundation hath no man laid than which is laid" by the Incarnate God. It is up through the facts of nature that we pass to the Power, not ourselves, who rides upon the storm to govern it, and energizes the stars in their courses. It is by means of these redemptive facts that we come in connection with the presence and life of the stooping, sacrificing, and delivering Heart of Love at the center of the universe, by whom are all things, and for whom are all things. (So persistent and wide-spread had been the representation that the Thirty-nine Articles constitute the creed of the Episcopal Church, that it may be said here with propriety, that she never has had, does not now have, and never will have any other creed than the Apostles'. The Nicene Creed is an explanatory enlargement of the New Testament "form of sound words.")

A great psychological law in education is the touch and communication of spiritual energy from one soul to another. This law operates just as vitally and constructively in the spiritual education of personality as in all other soul growth and achievement. Our Lord cordially recognized it and commented upon it. He was to pass out of and be above the physical limitations of Incarnation; but, all the same, He would come to His people, so that, by continued giving of

Himself to them, they would be successfully energized in the conquering of truth for character-building, and the subjection of the world to the obedience of the *cross*. And this brings up the whole subject of personality communicating with personality. How does soul touch soul and impart itself, as men go their various walks in life, as they help and hinder, as they achieve and rest, in social condition?

The individual spirit reaches and communicates with the outside world by means of the physical brain and senses. One spirit touches and communicates with another spirit by means of some physical copula.

"The baby new to earth and sky"

communicates with grown-ups with no other language than a cry, and that cry is a physical thing. The cordial handshake symbolizes friendship. The soldier on the field of battle, on looking up at the colors, has his patriotism aroused, and he is sustained by a renewed sense of the interests of home and nationality. A letter and the post service are the physical means used by the mother to communicate to her absent boy her interested love and her confidence. And so on to the end of spirit touching and communicating with spirit, under the reign of a fixed and invariable law. Very early in the Divine Society this law, as it has to do with the Lord's Supper, was called "the sacramental principle." But—

"What's in a name? that which we call a rose
By any other name would smell as sweet,"—

and this ever-present psychological law, by whatever name it may be called, would be the same. It is the nature and character of the law which give force and meaning to the name. And, then, there is the law of the appropriateness in the symbols of the soul touch and communion. The artist would never think of attempting to express the ethical ideas of faith,

Vol. LXIX. No. 273. 5

hope, and charity by the figures of three strong and burly men. Plighted and loyal love is fittingly symbolized by a precious stone, or some such thing. When the Roman Senate sent a sword to Carthage, the purpose of the Senate was made clear. The mercy-seat in the Holy Place of the Hebrew tabernacle was overlaid with pure gold. It was at the mercy-seat that Almighty God made known His presence; so that there could have been a no more fitting symbolizing of His attitude towards sin, and man's need of forgiveness. These principles of expression are a part of the constitution of human nature.

And so, what did Our Lord do in the presence of this psychological condition to assure the perpetual inflow of Himself into His faithful people? For the cardinal New Testament doctrine is that of God and man in a living state of communion. His people must feed upon Him for soul growth and guidance in the ways of truth and service. When Incarnate, He conveyed Himself by voice, look, touch, and wonderful words of spoken truth — all physical *media*. Now that He is in glory, spiritual touch and communion with believers must be in obedience to the sacramental principle, and other physical symbols are required. And not only so, the symbols must be such as to meet all involved expectation. Now the spiritual meaning of bread to the devout Hebrew was character, and the blood meant the life. The sacred record shows the use made of these by Our Lord in instituting the Christian Passover. For, "In the night in which he was betrayed," He set apart and consecrated bread and wine as the physical things to connect and convey to all believing souls, His spiritual Body and Blood; in other words, His Character and Life; that is, Himself. It is distinctly noticeable that, after each blessing or consecration, He enjoins: "Do this in remembrance

of me." A single question brings out the very heart and sacrificial nature of the Lord's Supper. Who is Me? Jesus the Son of God, "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever more." St. John makes this fundamental truth clear when he says of the Crucified One, He was and is "the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world." The Word was made flesh, and was manifested in and through earthly conditions, for the express end of establishing forever, in human thought and emotion, the fact that Love is sacrificial. As He has done, so He does now, and ever will do world without end. Therefore, as oft as ye do this, do it in full knowledge of the fact that, in identically the same spirit of merciful approach and forgiveness, the glorified Lord will inflow Himself into repentant and believing souls. They will feed on Him, and be filled with all heavenly benediction.

This is the Apostolic and Primitive teaching of the Lord's Supper. It is expressly stated and taught in St. John vi. 48-63 and 1 Cor. xi. 23-27. It is, indeed, the Holy Communion. At an early date it was called "the Eucharistic Sacrifice," which, by interpretation, means, "the Sacrifice of Thanksgiving." It was offered every Lord's Day; and now, where parish needs require, the sacrifice is offered every day in the year. It is the very center and originating heart of human and divine reconciliation.¹

¹For fifteen hundred years this was the teaching of the Divine Society. The fierce attack of the sixteenth century on Apostolic doctrine opened the way for the religious speculation of the Greek philosophers to become prominent. The chief one was the pagan definition of sacrifice. In no way at all did this embody and set forth the idea of personal and spiritual communion with the imagined god. The essence of the act was offering that which it was supposed the god needed, to be kept good-natured and in his proper place. On the other hand, when Abraham builded an altar, it was for divine worship or communion through the *media*

The final fact everywhere conspicuous in the sacred record is that the Divine Society of the New Testament was a brotherhood — a democracy — “the family of God.” Her ministry was for the teaching of revealed grace and the enforcement, with the authority of its divine origin, of the law of mercy and reconciliation. Such she remained until her calamitous incorporation by Constantine into the Rōman imperial system of government. Such she was in England until the Norman Conquest. Then in various ways began the enforcement on the Anglican Communion of the imperialized ecclesiasticism of Papal Rome. From this she has suffered grievously and keenly feels that she suffers now. In this country the Anglican Communion exists, known as Episcopal, and is a “Free Church in a Free State.”

Men in all associated relations are governed by law. Scientists have made it quite clear that the law of reversion to type holds inexorable sway in every corner of this physical world. It is just as operative in social and religious things. This law in religious thought and practice has been operating effectively within the memory of living people. It is not very long ago that the Puritan brother would have it that his place of worship was “a meeting-house,” and not a church; to-day it is the latter, and offense is sometimes taken over the use of the former term. The chief feasts and fasts of the Apostolic body were rejected as “pagan survivals”; now they are quite generally accepted because of expressing great facts and principles of the animal offered. In other words, sacrifice meant communion with Almighty God. This is and ever has been the Christian doctrine of sacrifice. The Lord's Supper is the sacrifice of the ever-approaching and glorified Lord and the repentant believer in communion; both touch in the heavenly fellowship. The fact of its being a sacrifice is the originating source of the priestly function of the Apostolic ministry; for certainly a sacrifice postulates a sacrifice.

ciples of divine grace. The Primitive and Eastern theology embedded in the Book of Common Prayer was once contraband; to-day there is a distinct and steady return to it. Not very long ago it was stoutly said and taught that Our Lord did not found the Divine Society, nor did He ordain a ministry, nor establish the sacrament of grace. Impartial scholarship has compelled the recognition of all these points of fundamental importance. However, the old negation comes up in the affirmation that the historical continuity was lost somewhere in the troubled times of the Middle Ages. Again this is a matter of historical evidence, and there is an abundance to establish and preserve forever the principle of continuity. Because of the intense and aggressive individualism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the vote of the congregation was affirmed the source of creedal and ecclesiastical authority. It should never be forgotten that those men wrought honestly according to their conclusions. What is more, all of the compelling forces involved were not their creation, — very far from it. But now comes, far and away, the highest Puritan authority on the Apostolic and Primitive periods,¹ who shows that it was not so in Palestine and the regions round about in those early and formative days. He says that the Greek words used in describing the government of local Christian bodies prohibits any such conclusion. It is not so very long ago that it was confidently taught that Christianity was introduced into Britain by Augustine. The great German and English writers on Jurisprudence, with no other object than that of stating the sources of the great Common Law, make it clear that the Divine Society was in Britain long before the Roman mission, that she formed the English Nation, and furnished the social-political principles of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Christian people cordially be-

¹ Sir W. M. Ramsay, *Pictures of the Apostolic Church*, p. 169.

believing in Our Lord as the Incarnate God, and, without mental or moral reservation, accepting His redemptive work, are in league with one of the great laws governing all things, whether seen or unseen. Stop its operation? As well try to stop the sun shining, or the rivers running in their courses to the sea.

ARTICLE V.

NIETZSCHE MADNESS.

BY PRINCIPAL CHARLES H. LERCH, A.M., EASTON, PA.

A CHARGE might be brought against the critic of Nietzsche who was not born and bred to the traditions of German thought and literary expression, that he is naturally disqualified from grasping the full connotation and content of what might seem to him mere philosophical gerrymandering. The writer of this paper, however, puts his confidence in his competent translators and interpreters, and keeps to a line of thought which has been so often reiterated that it has become Nietzsche commonplace. The philosophical attitude of the poet-philosopher is fairly evident, notwithstanding the ramifications of thought or no-thought which a fanciful hermeneutics might direct.

Lack of sympathy with our philosopher, due to foreign birth and long-range acquaintanceship, it might be charged again, is at least the foster-mother, if nothing more, of unfair insouciance. Be it granted. How can it be otherwise with any one who has carelessly, even, read Nietzsche! The very key-note of his teaching is, Do not have any sympathy for any one; do not yield to that weakness which Christianity exalts as a virtue. To interpret the philosopher sympathetically would be to place him before the world in any way but the true light. If ever the stoical attitude of Matthew Arnold, that one in forming correct judgments must get rid of himself, must be assumed, it is necessary for the student of Nietzsche, for his master inculcates it. If one were

brought to bay by his admirers for handling unsympathetically and uncongenially things Nietzsche, he might defend himself by the verbal weapons forged by the philosopher himself, "Let them go to the devil and to statistics."

It would not be in good form to assault the ramparts of this earth-philosophy with the ordinary weapons of commonplace critical batteries. The superman critic must dirempt himself of all things man. The superman critic may snap his superfingers at all present trumpery ideals of criticism. He must live alone, straight-jacketed within his own mental content, looking out upon the four corners of things with no outward disillusionment. He must hold, with our New England transcendentalist, "our actual knowledge very cheap. Hear the rats in the wall, see the lizard on the fence," comments this philosopher, "the fungus under foot, the lichen on the log. What do I know sympathetically, morally, of either of these worlds of life? The idiot, the Indian, the child and unschooled farmer's boy stand nearer to the light by which nature is to be read than the dissector or the antiquary." Likewise the German transcendentalist holds our actual knowledge somewhat cheap and, perhaps, it might be said with justice, that the idiot or the Indian, or even the untutored swain, stands nearer the light by which his meaning may be interpreted than does the sapient critic. In reading Nietzsche one has much the same experience as did a certain English statesman, who, during a period of recovery from some physical ailment, picked up one of Emerson's Essays and attempted to read. 'After some effort at comprehension he handed the book to his wife, and made this significant inquiry, "Am I insane?" Thus spake Zarathustra: "What with man is the ape? A joke or a sore shame. Man shall be the same for beyond-man, a joke or a sore shame.

Ye have made your way from worm to man and much within you is still worm. Once ye were apes, even now man is ape in a higher degree than any ape." According to this philosophy even the superape may not come far short of the glory of playing the rôle of a critic, for only the language of an ape is intelligible to an ape.

Without soliciting sympathy, and with the hauteur of the beyond-man, what can hinder the critic of Nietzsche from taking him at his own word? He is to brook no master, but to develop the spirit of egoism. "Egoism," says our philosopher, "belongs to the essence of the distinguished soul; I mean by that the immortal belief that to a being like us, other beings are naturally in subjection and have to sacrifice themselves. The distinguished soul accepts this fact of its egoism without any question, without any feeling of harshness, compulsion, or arbitrariness about it." In the light of this egotistical envisagement the critic becomes a law unto himself. He is absolutely the master of his own inerrant spirit, and brings into subjection all other critical spirits to himself. If you think that he plays havoc with your conception of the truth, which your beloved philosopher inculcates, you must yield your will to the supercritic, who has the absolute right, with obeisance to none, to hand down such opinions as he lists. It would not be a mark of distinguishment if the supercritic even so much as glanced about him to take note whether there are others around who dared to dispute his right of supremacy. Sympathy and humility cannot be predicated of the nature and character of the beyond-man student of Nietzsche.

And yet, in spite of all the protest against sympathy and altruism, the admirers of the poet-philosopher who translate and expound his meaning are absolutely under his sway.

Some of them are altruistic to such a degree that it seems to us they are willing to sacrifice their sanity. "Sympathy," says their master, "preserves what is ripe for extinction." We believe that sympathy only has kept, and still keeps, alive a great deal of Nietzsche, which by its very nature and substance is rotten and morally putrid. These fond lovers of his are trying to systematize the wild ejaculations of the mad immoralist, and thus, out of sympathy, read their own meaning into him. "An effort has been made," says one of the publishers of Zarathustra, "to render the meaning clearly in language worthy of the lofty theme." Quite an effort, the reader of this book must think, it would take to render the meaning of insanity into language comprehensible by the sound mind. In all this the lovers are not true to the teachings of the master. They preserve what is ripe for extinction, and thus prevent his immoral taking-off,—an event which should have transpired long ago. System and meaning cannot be predicated of the sayings and teachings of any man who is in an abnormal condition of mind and body; they can only be discovered by those who read liberally and sympathetically between the lines. "Nothing in our unsound modernism," advocates Nietzsche, "is unsounder than Christian sympathy." "The weak and ill-constituted shall perish." It was Christian charity which pensioned him when, quite early in life, he became incapacitated to continue in his professorship. Nietzsche, for the last twenty-four years of his life was not a case of the survival of the fittest. Yet it was through these years that his teachings emerged out of the shattered fragments of his battered ego and brought him a following. At his own request the weak-minded and ill-constituted transcendentalist should have been permitted to perish long ago. Sympathy, his much-despised Christian

sympathy, shielded him through all these years, and it is this same feeling which keeps his spirit alive to-day.

Goldwin Smith in his life of the English poet Cowper says, "Once for all, the reader of Cowper's life must make up his mind to acquiesce in religious forms of expression. If he does not sympathize with them, he will recognize them as phenomena of opinion and bear them like a philosopher. He can easily translate them in the language of psychology or even physiology, if he thinks fit." That is to say, if one cannot fall in with the religious spirit of the poet he is at liberty to interpret such words as these,—

"There is a fountain filled with blood,
Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains,"—

in terms of psychology or physiology as he may see fit. It is one of those convenient ways that the scientific scholars have of translating the expression of the spirit, which transcends the bounds of the vacuous jargon of absolute science, into the content of neurosis and psychosis. Thus Paul, no doubt, after such a declaration as, "I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me," or, "In all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us," is in danger of creating suspicion in some quarters, that, at the time of his pronouncement, he was physically impaired, or suffering from some mental disturbance. John the Baptist was nothing more than a raving maniac as he shouted from the borders of the wilderness, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Christian experience, as viewed by these sane men, who are not given to hallucinations, and who do not allow their emotional nature to give evidence of resili-

ience, is synonymous with mental aberration, if not with insanity.

But how about Nietzsche? In what terms are we to translate his mind as he comes out of the wilderness of his retirement from active life and shouts like one in whom neurosis and psychosis seem to be in tortuous torment: "A being capable of purely altruistic actions alone is more fabulous than the Phoenix. Never has a man done anything solely for others and without any personal motive. How could the ego act without the ego? Suppose a man wished to do and to will everything for others, nothing for himself, the latter would be impossible for the very good reason that he must do very much for himself in order to do anything at all for others." "In order to subsist the highest morality must positively enforce the existence of immorality." "Christianity," he raves further, "is the one great curse, the one great spiritual corruption, the one great instinct of revenge, for which no means are too poisonous, secret, subterranean, or mean." If Paul, John, and other Christians were giving evidence, through their teachings, of neurological disturbances, would it be too much to say that, from these and other sayings of the German philosopher, we believe that he was afflicted with madness? Well, the fact is that Nietzsche was during the greater part of his life physically and mentally far from normal. He was compelled to give up his professorship quite early in his career; and between 1876 and 1900, we are told, he passed "through a long valley of desolation, illness, and solitude . . . a change afflicting and obscure had come over him. . . . Alone and often suffering, he lost his self-control." "Are then the meditations of a mind so disordered worth pursuing?" asks one of his reviewers.

We know how exact scholarship would regard in the re-

ligious world the mawkish and grotesque ejaculations of a madman. In fact, one need not depart far from the hypothesis and postulates of the orthodoxy of so-called exact science before he will be viewed with some suspicion of mental errancy or deflection of some kind. Preserve your equanimity, let not your cold intellect be swayed in the slightest degree by the unholy emotions of your flesh or spirit, are the demands of science, or of scientific accuracy in any field of knowledge. Exact scholarship pretends only to take seriously the intellectual output of a phlegmatic temper and a clear brain. Imagine how much consideration Paul, Peter, and John would receive from these sticklers for Knowledge that must not be tainted by the imagination or the emotions, if it were so much as hinted that any one of these had been compelled to give up his preaching, even for a short time, because of a nervous break-down or physical wreckage of some kind! Suppose that it were a well-known fact that one of the most stirring, suggestive of New Testament writers had been necessitated, during the last twenty-four years of his life, as was the case with Nietzsche, to spend his time at health-resorts seeking health and finding none, and that at last he had collapsed, being consumed, as it were, by the fire of his theological or philosophical ravings, would learned professors in universities have paid their respects to him or would they do so now? We fear it would not help the cause of such an unfortunate apostle, if it were suggested that, in his moments of *Aufklärung*, he had propounded great questions, and had called the attention of the thinking men to great issues.

But there is another indictment against the German philosopher which ought to minister against the worth of his teaching; and that is that his temperament is poetic. His ad-

mirers call him the poet-philosopher. He was not a trained philosopher, but a self-made one. The earliest evidence of his real bent discloses itself first in his philological writings. In theology or science in general, an untrained scholar would not receive serious recognition, and the poetic aspect of his mind would not help him out. Many scientific men, we fear, agree, in other than a figurative sense, with Macaulay, that the truth of poetry "is the truth of madness." It is often the chief criticism upon religious writers that they sacrifice the truth at the altar of the imagination. Accordingly, Christ himself hides his meaning in parables, in figures of rhetoric; and his truth is therefore the truth of madness and illusion, and is to be regarded with suspicion and indifference. With Nietzsche, however, it is different. Poetry, which the truth-builders often reject, becomes the chief corner-stone of his master-structure. His poetic style, which is the pride of his own heart, covers a multitude of sins.

In spite of all protest, in spite of common sense, the reactionary spirit of the German egoist, it seems, is becoming somewhat of a *Zeitgeist* in some quarters. "If there be gods," says he, "how could I endure not to be one of them?" That is the spirit of rebellion against the powers that be, especially against the tyranny of blood and iron in the Fatherland. Man desires freedom here below, emphatically here below, since the earth-song of Nietzsche has blown upon the breeze. Hence apparently sane men are ready to throw away their reason and to subscribe to the incendiaryism and unreason of the poet-philosopher. Courses of lectures, we understand, are devoted to him in many of the universities of his native country. New art, new literature, new life in general, is to be a function of the development of his teaching and personality.

What, then, are some of these inspirational truths which draw men's attention Nietzsche-ward? To study the philosopher fragmentarily is allowable, for the whole of Nietzsche is not in every part. "A being capable of purely altruistic actions alone is more fabulous than the Phoenix. Never has a man done anything solely for others, and without any personal motive. How could the ego act without the ego?" Who has ever seen a being so purely altruistic that the ego disappeared entirely in the sacrifice? If he imagines such altruism taught by Christianity, we think that he is mistaken. When in a moment of Christian inspiration the multitudes, on one occasion, laid almost all their possessions at the apostles' feet, and when it seemed as if all things might be consumed by the altruistic fire of love, there were still a few egos left unscathed and uninjured. Peter, John, James, and Paul stood the altruistic test, and came out of the pressure in a rational, sound frame of mind. Not all virtue had gone out of them. There was still sufficient consciousness of the ego to be found in Peter and John, after they had performed their altruistic service of helping a lame man to locomotion, so that one of them cried out to the marveling crowd, "Why fasten ye your eyes on us?" Christ never taught an altruism which would result in self-effacement. "There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for my sake, and for the gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands." No man after the Christian fashion can be truly altruistic without receiving assets to his ego. No man can be a worthy ego without being altruistic. If Jesus on one occasion says, "Leave all and follow me," on another he exhorts, "Seek, and ye shall find." The Christian injunction

Be not anxious about to-morrow is answered by "Work while it is called to-day." The man who works his talents, whether silver, or gold, or brains, is commended. The Christian ethic teaches self-help for and through the assistance of others.

An ego, it must not be overlooked, cannot thrive in a vacuum. "A man," writes Emerson, "is a bundle of relations, a knot of roots, whose flower and fruitage is the world. . . . Put Napoleon in an island prison, let his faculties find no men to act on, no Alps to climb, no stake to play for, and he would beat the air and appear stupid." Was the Emperor an ego? Yes, not second in rank to our poet-philosopher. Was he an altruist after the manner of Nietzsche's Imagining? Did he not strive to out-ego all other egos? Did he succeed? Was Napoleon great because of his selfishness or in spite of it? Suppose that his creed had been service, self-sacrifice, would he have been the inferior master as he had played the rôle of a diligent servant? An ego that is worth while is the product of altruism, not its ruling spirit. If Nietzsche had not been considerable of an altruist, he would not have allowed a single sentence of his to go into print. A man who constantly harbors such an ugly sentiment towards humanity as he expresses in these words: "There are only three respects in which the masses appear to me to deserve a glance — first, as blurred copies of great men, executed on bad paper and from worn-out plates; secondly, as opposition to the great; and lastly, as instruments for the great; for the rest let them go to the devil and to statistics," would not care to utter a word in bare recognition of it. If it is answered that he expressed himself solely for the interests of the superman, and that only the ideal man, who is to be, the reply to that might be, that underneath his surface contempt for the

race there must be a spirit of sympathy for the interest of the best of mankind.

It seems to us an extremely difficult matter to bring any kind of order out of the chaos of Nietzsche's thinking; and that extreme admiration for him, alone, can put out the critic's eyes. If you quote him on a certain question and hold him responsible for the stand which he is taking, a devotee of his might fetch you up from some other quarter of his teaching a saying which is not the presentation of another phase of the larger truth, but a contradiction of the basic evaluation of his former position. If you would censure him for being a zealot in his quest for the superman, one might cite him as declaring, "Everything good is instinct, and consequently easy, necessary, free." When he speaks of the human ideal as consisting in "the spiritualization of sensuousness," you might remind him that in another place he says, "It is the voice of the healthy body." "Ye are only bridges. Would that higher ones would stride over you unto the other side! Ye signify stairs. Then be not angry with him who riseth above you unto his own height," is an exhortation which does not bring good cheer to the ambitious soul who feels, "If there be gods, how could I endure not to be one of them?" And so through page after page he flounders, leaving the reader to the destiny of discovering his meaning.

In one respect, however, his position is clear; and that is in his attitude towards Christianity, as he interprets it. The only Christian that ever lived, he contends, died on the cross. He can hardly conjure up enough contempt for others who fall so far short of the pattern in the mount. But how about Nietzsche himself in relation to his superman ideal? Did he, in his own life, attain to the glory of that conception? Sim-

mel, a German critic, suggests that perhaps the constant gnawing sense of the discrepancy between the Zarathustra self of his prophetic vision and the Nietzsche self of the nineteenth-century reality was one of the principal features of the strain which eventually brought about his mental collapse. Christianity or quasi-Christianity as it is lived, or half lived, is one thing; as it is conceived by its Founder and expounded as an ideal life, it is another thing. It is our conviction that the German philosopher's hostility is nothing short of an expression of rebellion against the very idea of God himself. The first tenet of Nietzsche's decalogue, we imagine, might read, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me"; "If there be gods, how could I endure not to be one of them?"

The God of the Christian, says our philosopher, is dead; hence he must create one for himself and those who, like himself, are also in search of one. "I teach you beyond-man." The beyond-man is the creation for which we shall allow ourselves to be sacrificed and for which others must sacrifice. "Be not angry with him who riseth above you"; "Ye signify stairs." This superman is not to be an ogre in morals, in spite of Nietzsche's teaching that "in order to subsist, the highest morality must positively enforce the existence of immorality." Whatever he means by immorality, whether as commonly accepted or in a unique Nietzsche-sense, the friends of the philosopher say that he was not immoral himself. Yet "The moralists," he expounds, "seem to have a hatred of the primeval forest. . . . People utterly misunderstand the beast of prey and the man of prey (Cæsar Borgia, for example)." The superman character, we have a right to believe, should display virtue "free from any moralic acid," and should be of the primeval-forest, Cæsar-Borgia type. But to send man back to the primeval forest and to

instinct is to flatly contradict that other high-sounding teaching of the advocate of immorality, "Once ye were apes, even now man is ape in a higher degree than any ape." "Man is something that shall be surpassed. What have we done to surpass him?" Just to be an ape or a Cæsar Borgia does not require effort. His superman is to be an absolute product of the earth. "Beyond-man," he emphasizes, "shall be the significance of earth"; "I conjure you, my brethren, remain faithful to earth, and do not believe those who speak unto you of superterrestrial hopes"! Nietzsche strove hard to confine his superman god to earth, but he would break his chains and escape heavenwards. We imagine that the words of Æneas as he tried to embrace the ghost of his wife would express the state of mind of the poet-philosopher as the un-material ghost of his superman creation was constantly eluding him, even to madness:—

"Ter conatus ibi collo dare brachia circum;
Ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago."

But was Nietzsche's superman simply an earth-born Titan? Was he ever fully realized? "I teach you the beyond-man" is his mission, as he tells us again and again. The beyond-man never is, but always casts his shadow before him as he recedes into the future. He is an ideal, and cometh from afar, and not out of the earth. He is made, largely, we fear, of pure mind stuff, as Kingdon Clifford would put it, and should be consigned to mythology. The elements which are mixed in his supercreation and which add to it some human stability are also imparted and are superterrestrial. Whatever is decent and respectable about the overman is Christian, and not of the earth earthy. If Nietzsche strove hard to be Greek or Heathen, he was still somewhat of a Christian in spite of himself. He was born in a Christian family, and could not

altogether dirempt himself of his early influences. If out of his mouth proceed sayings which might stanp him a degenerate, his enthusiastic admirers would have us believe that as far as his character is concerned he was not the living exponent of his teaching. "Nietzsche never accepted for himself," says a writer about him, "the dictates of his cruel philosophy. The Greeks, whom he worshiped, would have left the wounded privates on the field. Why should any one take trouble to preserve the lives of slaves?" The philosopher, however, in war time, traveled with his ambulance, night after night, tending the sufferers, exposing himself to the maladies which follow in the wake of destruction. If men are the creators of their gods, as Nietzsche and some others seem to imagine, then it is not out of the heart of the philosopher, which his friends claim was a fountain of purity and nobleness, that such a demon of selfishness as the overman could be evolved. We must look for the origin of this superinhuman creature elsewhere.

Can man be the creator of his God? Is it possible for him to be an out-and-out maker of anything? Does he manufacture his concepts and ideals, or do they come to him as the result of growth and evolution through obedience? Was Nietzsche not, like the Christian, obedient to the superterrestrial calling as he abandoned himself to an ideal which he insisted must be mundane, but which would elude him and dwell in the region of the super-mundane?

"Ideas and ideals, through obedience, grow
As grows the grass,
Art might obey but not surpass,
The passive master lent his hand
To the vast soul that o'er him planned."

The vast soul, terrestrial soul, vast in the extent of evil and damage it wrought in the mind of the poet-philosopher, which entered greatly into the content of his thought, was Schopenhauer, or some other spirit from whom he could not altogether free himself in spite of his boast of intellectual independence. It was quite early in his life when he came across the path of Schopenhauer, who overturned his theory of all values, and started him on the road to destruction. So infatuated did the pupil become with the master, so imbued with his spirit, that he called the pessimist his father. There can be no greater delusion than that of a man-creation. Ideas only rise and develop as man allows himself to become the diligent servant of a self, vaster than himself, that over him plans. Nietzsche's superman conception matures in proportion to the various intellectual forces which fecundate his mind. The influence is from without and not from within.

Nietzsche's antagonism to Christianity is due either to a wilful misunderstanding or ignorance of the spirit of its ethics. He despises it because its kingdom is not of this world. He does not seem to be aware that though it has the forward look, the earth is its habitation, and seat of its activity. If unnatural, impractical asceticism has been the law and expression of its past life, it does not follow that such an interpretation was the original intent of its Founder! Nietzsche was far more of a recluse than Christ. Jesus never lived apart from men, but spent a life of service in the midst of them. His exhortations are practicable and apply to the present: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," now; "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, and ye shall find," now. These are the ethical teachings which are meant for the life that now is; and without the present possession of life all the outlook for the future will be barren. "As you

sow " now, " so shall you reap " hereafter. " Work," now, " while it is called to-day."

As for rewards and punishments which are to stimulate men to correct living, upon the idea of which the German philosopher pours out his vials of wrath, there is a glorious misunderstanding. Rewards, we might say, are in the nature of the case. Nietzsche himself says, " Never has a man done anything solely for others and without any personal motive." If that is so, what objection can there be to the doctrine? " Great is your reward in heaven." But does the Gospel message inculcate the spirit of service for reward only? " Whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant. Even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his life a ransom for many." The personal motive, if any, becomes a kind of unconscious or subconscious cerebration with the true Christian as he loses himself in spiritual activity. The superman of Nietzsche does things for others by yielding to the selfish motive altogether. He is to ride on in majesty in defiance of the rights and privileges of others. What he leaves behind him in his self-aggrandizement is wreckage, not life. Through selfish seeking of his own life he loses it. That has been the history of every superman monster that gave himself first, last, and all the time to his own interests. " How could the ego act without the ego," says Nietzsche. Not very well, we must answer. But what is left of the ego after it has out-egoed itself in its selfishness? History bears evidence to the fact that he that loses his life in the help of others finds it, and he that meanly seeks his own loses by and by that which he now possesses. Nietzsche's teaching of the overman ethics is just as much a doctrine of reward as that of the Christian which he maligns. It is not more terrestrial or of the present. " Upward, life itself,"

says the philosopher, "striveth to build itself with the pillars and stairs unto far distances, it longeth to gaze and outwards after blessed beauties. Therefore it needeth height." "For what would be my love for beyond-man, if I spake otherwise?" Is it not the beatific vision of the superman that fecundates his spirit to climb the celestial stairs? Is not the Christian caught up into the heaven of a similar enthusiasm as he forgets himself in his pressing forward to the mark of the high calling? The Christian's ideal is not a superman monster, a Borgia, or a Cæsar, but the Strong Son of God, who does not take away life, but gives it abundantly. The reward is not insanity, spiritual destruction, but peace and joy now and hereafter. It is this very peace and joy which Nietzsche is unconsciously seeking; but his perverse and degenerate teaching and spirit, we fear, never find it. A caricature of Carlyle, in the energetic style of Lowell, sets forth realistically the case of the poet-philosopher: "Constitutional monarchy is a failure, representative government is a gabble, democracy a birth of the bottomless pit. There is no hope for mankind except in getting themselves under a good driver, who shall not spare the lash. . . . Meanwhile the world's wheels have got fairly stalled in mire and other matter of every vilest consistency and most disgusting smell. What are we do do? Carlyle will not let us make a lever with a rail from the next fence, or call in the neighbors. . . . No, he would have us sit down beside him in the slough and shout lustily for Hercules. If that indispensable demigod will not or cannot come we can find a useful and instructive solace, during the interval of shouting, in hearty abuse of human nature, which, at the long last, is always to blame."

ARTICLE VI.

MODERATE CRITICISM.¹

BY THE REVEREND G. S. GRIFFITHS, UPPINGHAM, ENGLAND.

THIS work may be fairly described as a plausible but somewhat misleading presentation, from the "Moderate" standpoint, of the modern critical view of the Pentateuch. It is written throughout in a clear and eminently readable style. The subject-matter is well-arranged, and the book is furnished with copious indices and an excellent analysis. Every page bears witness to the author's industry and literary skill. His general attitude towards the Old Testament Scriptures is one of profound reverence. He displays no sympathy with the extreme positions and reckless methods of some recent critics. His treatment of the subject is marked by seriousness and moderation, and the appearance of great fairness. Perhaps its most notable quality is its air of invincible patience. The picture which it suggests is that of a singularly patient teacher instructing a group of critical but rather stupid pupils, answering their questions, wrestling with their difficulties, disposing of their objections, and anxious always that every detail should be made plain. For these and other merits of the book the credit rightly belongs to the author himself. Its defects, on the other hand, are partly due to the limits within which the work is compressed, but chiefly to the essential weakness of the cause which it represents.

The author states the critical theory in the form of three

¹ *An Introduction to the Pentateuch.* By A. T. Chapman, M.A., Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Pp. xx, 339. Cambridge: The University Press. 3s. 6d., net.

Propositions: (1) The Pentateuch (he uses the term Hexateuch, but on grounds that are quite inadequate) contains passages of later date than the time of Moses and Joshua. (2) The Pentateuch is a composite work in which four documents (at least) can be distinguished. (3) The laws in the Pentateuch consist of three separate Codes which belong to different periods in the history of Israel; D being assigned to the reign of Josiah, and P to Ezra after the Return. The effective refutation in detail of these propositions and the various arguments by which they are here supported would require much more space than we can presume to occupy in this article. Besides, it is scarcely necessary in view of the work done by such writers as Green, Orr, G. L. Robinson, Wiener, and others. Several articles dealing fully with many of the most important points raised by Mr. Chapman have appeared in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA during recent years. But the following observations of a general character may be permitted.

With the author's First Proposition as it stands no traditionalist would be inclined to quarrel. It is true that arguments against the Mosaic date of the Pentateuch based on the particular passages cited by Mr. Chapman have been sufficiently answered by many modern writers. But even if this had not been done, the passages in question would prove no more than that the text, which must have been copied and edited over and over again through a period of many centuries, had suffered certain modifications and additions in the process. Indeed, on the assumption that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, the presence of *post-Mosaica* in the text is not nearly so astonishing as their absence would have been. Certainly they are insufficient to outweigh the great mass of internal and external evidence on the other side.

In defending his Second Proposition the author (very prudently, as we think) does not attach so much value to the Astruc "clue" as the earlier critics did. He uses it merely to "confirm results obtained by other critical methods, or, as establishing a probability which is strengthened by further investigation." But in view of the fact that recent textual criticism has utterly discredited this famous "clue," it is difficult to see what can be *confirmed* or *established* by it. Seeing it has signally failed to establish itself, it would have been more discreet, not to say more candid, to have abandoned it altogether, and relied entirely on the "other critical methods."

The argument from *style* and *vocabulary* is set forth at some length. We are regaled with the customary lists of words and phrases supposed to be characteristic of the different alleged documents. Mr. Chapman is much more cautious in his use of these than many modern critics, but his analysis will only impress those who are ignorant of the following (among other) facts, viz., (1) That the literary affinities of P and E are so great that down to 1853 they were believed to be the work of one author. (2) That J and E are so similar in style that the most skillful critical dissectors admit the extreme difficulty — in some cases impossibility — of distinguishing between them. (3) That the literary analysis is by no means so independent of the Astruc "clue" as Mr. Chapman believes. (4) That the critical division into "documents" presupposes a considerable limitation of "style" in the case of each author. (5) That the critical theory requires for its support, not only the postulating of a number of "redactors" whose proceedings, according to the critical theorists (who appear to know them best), are characterized by an amazing inconsistency; but also a minuter

subdivision into "series" of documents (J^1 , J^2 , J^3 , and so forth). (6) That in any case the argument from style must be largely subjective; and that, in fact, critical writings show that it is so. And (7) that it is far from certain that in an ancient book such as the Pentateuch, treating of a great variety of subjects, differences of style are an infallible indication of diversity of authorship.¹

In his argument for the composite character of the Pentateuch, our author has not allowed sufficient weight to the numerous signs of unity which are manifest in the work in its present form. He ignores the fact (to which his own analysis bears witness) that not one of the alleged "sources" J, E, and P, as it is found in the Pentateuch, is complete in itself. Many instances might be quoted in which statements contained in one document presuppose statements which are only found in another, and are quite unintelligible apart from them, so that if the documents ever existed in a separate and complete form, missing parts of one correspond to the extant portions of the others. It is in this connection that the various "redactors" prove such useful allies to the "critics." But on what principle they pieced together these fragments from different documents, or, indeed, why they should take pains to do so at all, is not explained. If P, e.g., ever existed as an independent document, and was generally accepted as an authentic representation of the Mosaic history and legislation, why should it be deemed necessary to combine it in this "mosaic" fashion with JE?

Mr. Chapman admits that "unity of purpose" is shown in the Pentateuch. He denies, however, that this fact indicates unity of authorship. He evidently believes that it may

¹ For the contrary view, see H. M. Wiener, *Origin of the Pentateuch*, p. 90.

be credited to the "redactors." But there is one striking mark of unity present in the Pentateuch which cannot properly be attributed to redactors however skillful they may have been — and the alleged redactors of the Pentateuch by all accounts were far from skillful! It may be noticed in the delineation of character. The chief personages in the history are well-defined, and the representation of them is consistent throughout. There are not three Jacobs or three Josephs appearing with different characteristics according as they are described by J, E, or P. It is the same Moses who is depicted in all the documents. This unity of representation is not artificial but organic. It is not confined to the author's comments upon his characters, which indeed are very few: it reveals itself naturally and spontaneously in the course of the narrative, in the actual incidents recorded. This phenomenon points to the substantial unity of the "sources" rather than to the harmonizing efforts of redactors.

The author's Third Proposition deals with the most important point of all, viz., the *dating* of the documents. He points out that in each document there is embedded a code of laws, and these codes enable him to discover the respective dates at which the documents were produced and published. He argues in favor of the sequence JE, D, P, on the two familiar lines: (1) comparison of the Codes with each other, emphasizing discrepancies and variations which appear to confirm his theory, while ignoring those differences which imply the priority of P to D; (2) comparison of the Codes with the history (or rather, with the Wellhausen version of the history), in the course of which he endeavors to show a "development" which reaches its climax in the system of P. His "test cases" are the laws concerning slavery, and the

regulation of worship. On these two selected battlefields we may commend him to the tender mercies of Mr. H. M. Wiener.

In common with most writers of the Moderate school, Mr. Chapman ignores the logical issues of the theory he expounds. The validity of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis depends, of course, on the quantity and weight of the evidence which may be adduced in its favor. But if that hypothesis be sound, then certain conclusions, usually termed "Rationalistic," as to the origin and development of the Hebrew religion, the inspiration of the Old Testament, and, ultimately, the character of Christianity itself as a Faith which has its roots deep down in the soil of the Mosaic dispensation, logically and inevitably follow. This is not merely admitted, but insisted upon by conservative writers and by most of the chief leaders of the modern critical movement. This fact taken alone is no refutation of the "critical theory." If, on other grounds, the truth of that theory can be demonstrated, the conclusions to which it points must be accepted. But it seems to us that they ought to be fully and frankly set forth in a book which is designed for the instruction of the rising generation.

It is a weakness of the Moderate party that while they accept the Wellhausen analysis, they appear to reject the religious theory on which it is partly based, as well as the estimate of Judaism and Christianity to which it leads. In this particular, Mr. Chapman's work shows no advance on that of his predecessors in the same field. He draws a distinction between the literary form of the Pentateuch—to which, mainly, he applies the critical method—and its contents, the greater part of which he believes to be very ancient. But his efforts to show that acceptance of the critical

analysis is consistent with a belief in the general trustworthiness and divine inspiration of the Pentateuch, though manifestly sincere, are by no means convincing.

He briefly mentions the fact that the "critical theory" is regarded with suspicion by many because of its association with rationalistic speculations and assumptions concerning miracles, prophecy, and the origin and growth of the Hebrew religion, and because of the avowed rationalism of some modern critical writers. But he does little to allay that suspicion. His reply is that such speculations and assumptions have nothing to do with higher criticism; that each argument should be judged on its merits; and that the strength and value of an argument does not depend upon the character of him who produces it. The reply is true in substance, but it only affects those cases in which rationalistic preconceptions are made the *basis* of the critical theory, and even here it is not relevant. It is true that rationalistic views of miracles, prophecy, etc., have nothing to do with genuine higher criticism whose province and methods are strictly literary; but they seem to have very much to do with the Pentateuchal criticism, the results of which are cordially accepted by our author and set forth in his book. He himself (p. 34) admits (as, indeed, he is bound to do) the inadequacy of the literary method (i.e. "higher criticism"; *vide* p. 21) alone. "To determine when the different documents contained in the Hexateuch were written is a *historical* investigation rather than a *literary* one." And it is precisely in the historical methods of the Wellhausen school that rationalistic views are not merely *associated* with the critical theory: they are part of the foundation on which it rests. Be it remembered that the *date* of the Pentateuch is the important point. But while literary criticism *may* demonstrate the composite character of the work and resolve it

into its original "documents," compositeness (even if it could be proved, which we doubt) is in itself no evidence of very late date. Nor (as we have seen) do the *post-Mosaic* and the linguistic *criteria* afford any sure support for the theory of post-Mosaic date. This is shown, e.g., by the fact that *literary* criticism (before it was reënforced by *historical* criticism) was unanimous in proclaiming P to be the earliest of the "sources": but the critics are now agreed that P is the *latest*. Genuine higher criticism is unable to establish the critical *dating* of the Pentateuch. And as it is the *date* that is important, it is irrelevant to say that speculations about inspiration and miracles have nothing to do with higher criticism. It would have been more to the point if Mr. Chapman could have said that rationalistic assumptions have nothing to do with modern *historical* criticism; but that is precisely what cannot be affirmed in view of the writings of Graf, Vatke, Wellhausen, Kuenen, and other acknowledged "founders of criticism."

Again, it is generally true that the force of an argument is independent of the orthodoxy of the critic. The fact that Wellhausen (e.g.) is a "rationalist" may not affect the cogency of his reasoning on many points; but when it is observed how prominent a part subjectivity plays in his literary analysis, and how frequently his rationalistic preconceptions are made an essential part of the basis of his theory, surely, devout believers may be excused if they regard the theory itself with some measure of suspicion.

But if Mr. Chapman's "reply" were sufficient to dissipate this suspicion, there still remains the other aspect of the connection between Rationalism and Modern criticism, viz., those cases in which the critical process leads inevitably to rationalistic conclusions. Let it be repeated that it is the *date* of

the Pentateuch that is important. On this depend its historical value and its divine inspiration. The Pentateuch professes to be the record of a Divine revelation communicated to Moses to be by him imparted to the Israelites. That revelation includes the spiritual truths which they were to believe, and the moral laws by which their conduct was to be governed. No doubt there are many who, like Mr. Chapman, succeed to their own satisfaction in combining acceptance of "critical results" with belief in the general trustworthiness of the Pentateuchal narratives and the supernatural origin of the revelation which they contain. How they do it we cannot even imagine. Certainly, it is by no known process of logic. For if these narratives were first committed to writing some centuries after the events which they describe, on what grounds can Mr. Chapman or any other "moderate" critic dispute the verdict of Kuenen, who regards even JE as unhistorical? Kuenen's opinion may be wrong — we believe it to be entirely wrong — but if his dating of the Codes is correct, his judgment on their historicity cannot be contested. It is true that numerous examples may be quoted of historical works, written long after the times of which they profess to be an account, which nevertheless are regarded as authoritative. But these works are based upon written documents. The case of the Pentateuch is different. For (1) it contains a number of extraordinary statements which are so inextricably interwoven with the narrative of the Exodus, the Sinaitic covenant, and the desert wanderings, that they cannot be eliminated without destroying the whole history, and which can be received only on the clearest possible evidence. And (2) it is obvious that this evidence must be, at least, contemporaneous. But the critical theory in its most moderate form (and this is certainly true of Mr. Chapman's state-

ment of it) contends that even the earliest of the Pentateuchal sources is founded upon oral tradition handed down from generation to generation through a period of some centuries. Sir W. Muir, who is certainly entitled to be heard on the subject of Oriental tradition, has clearly shown, by a reference to the actual growth of the Moslem tradition, that oral tradition pure and simple possesses no historical value after the lapse of a few generations. Under the most favorable conditions the oral traditions concerning Mahomet became a mass of discordant tales and wild extravagances. Two hundred years after the death of Mahomet, out of 600,000 traditions then current, only 2000 could be deemed to have the slightest claim to be regarded as authentic. What would have been the condition of oral traditions concerning Moses, to say nothing of Abraham, in the ninth century B.C.? The fact is that "the value of tradition depends absolutely on the date at which it ceased to be oral by being fixed in writing. After the lapse of a few generations oral tradition loses all pretence of simple truth. Instead of furnishing any material of fact whatever for history, it can be regarded but as the creature of fancy." If then the Pentateuch is only a collection of traditions committed to writing centuries after the time of which it professes to be a record, it cannot possess the slightest historical value—in other words, it is not what Mr. Chapman calls it, "a religious history": it is merely a religious romance.

But if the Pentateuch is unhistorical, what shall we say of the supernatural revelation of which it claims to be the medium? According to the biblical view expressed not only in the Pentateuch, but also by the prophets and historians, Jehovah chose Israel to be his peculiar people, befriended and protected them, delivered them out of the hands of their enemies, succored them

in distress, manifested himself to their leader, and gave them laws and ordinances by obedience to which they might prove their loyalty to him. But the critical view reverses all this, and conceives of Jehovah as chosen by Israel, and served and worshiped in ways which were discovered by repeated experiments through a long period. The two theories are diametrically opposed. The fact that Mr. Chapman, like other "moderate" writers, but unlike many advanced critics, regards a great part of the Pentateuchal legislation — even of the Priestly Code — as very ancient makes no difference. It matters little how ancient it was, if it was not Divinely communicated, but the result of many experiments, reformations, and revolutions. True, Mr. Chapman upholds its divinity on the ground that it is the development of laws and principles which were given through Moses from the beginning. But unhappily he has omitted to specify any such.

This reminds us that Mr. Chapman is not happy in his attempted refutation of the charge brought against the critical theory that it postulates a series of "frauds" perpetrated upon the Jewish people at various times by priests and prophets. According to criticism laws were imposed on the nation in the name of Moses of which Moses himself knew nothing. The reply to this appears to be that the successive codes were rightly attributed to Moses because they embodied principles which their authors regarded as communicated by God to Moses when the Hebrews were delivered from bondage and chosen by him as a people in order that "they might keep His statutes and observe His laws." Without enlarging upon the insuperable difficulties of the critical version of the circumstances in which Deuteronomy and the Priestly Code were published, we may refer to one point, Mr. Chapman's treatment of which is extremely unsatisfactory, viz., the crit-

ical explanation of the connection of Moses with the Jewish legislation.

If the Codes embody genuine Mosaic principles, what are those principles, and where may we hope to find them? According to our author's First Proposition, even JE must be dated long after the time of Moses. And he insists that even the author of Deuteronomy, though acquainted with the laws of JE, did not connect them with the Sinaitic covenant: he knew of no Mosaic legislation at Horeb save the Decalogue. Further, if the narratives rest only upon oral tradition there is no reliable *history* of Moses extant. How, then, may we be certified that the Codes were really drawn up "in the spirit of Moses"? Was Ezekiel's code not drawn up in the spirit of Moses? If it was Mosaic in spirit why was it too not ascribed to Moses? Was its failure to secure recognition due to the fact that it was published in the prophet's name instead of being attributed to Moses? On the critical hypothesis the only reasonable explanation of the ascription of the laws to Moses is, that his name invested them with an authoritative character which otherwise they would not have possessed. And this fact is itself a powerful argument for the genuineness of the Pentateuchal legislation. The belief that Moses was the Divinely appointed lawgiver of Israel, whose authority was greater than that of kings and prophets, could not have arisen at a late date. It could not have arisen *at any time* if it had no historical foundation.

Much more might be said, but the foregoing observations may suffice to show that Bowdlerized Wellhausenism is no better than the undiluted article.

ARTICLE VII.

THE REVIVAL OF BUDDHISM IN JAPAN.

BY THE REVEREND SAMUEL C. BARTLETT, OTARU, JAPAN.

"Oh, it is beginning to rain. Please let me out so that you can get in out of the rain."

"No, Granny, I have taken your money to pull you in my jinrikisha, and I could not let you down."

"Oh, never mind the money. I'm an old country-woman and used to the rain, but you are a smart city fellow and ought not to get wet."

THE gentle simplicity of this old dame is a fair sample of the large part of the two hundred and fifty thousand visitors who have recently gathered in Kyoto to honor the seven hundredth anniversary of the great new religious movement initiated by Hōnen Shōnin, who may be called the second founder of Buddhism.

There were many, many gaping thousands from the far country-side, with their tickets sewed on their sleeves, and divided into "bumpkin bands," each with its guide or hotel-runner at the head, and distinguished from innumerable other companies by gaudy badges or scarfs or turbans to match their leaders' banners. From temple to temple of the lesser lights of the Jōdō sect they trudged, gathered in twos and threes and fives where the evangelistic bands, over a hundred strong of picked men, were preaching the gospel of Amida's mercy; and with tears of joy, cries of admiration, and sighs of awe climbed up to where Chiōnin's mighty temple was hung with thousands of yards of rainbow silk in strips a yard wide.

Chiōnin is the temple most intimately connected with the faith. Here were held the great ceremonies, to which mu-

sicians from Tokyo, and bands of dancers from further away, gave their services, and thousands of priests gave their presence. At Chiōnin was unspeakable bustle of selling amulets, badges, books, and maps, as well as lunches and other food. But the remoter corners of the temple grounds and graveyards were the scene of many a touching burst of emotion and piety. Buddhism seemed most dead where it was most gorgeous, and most alive in these sighs and tears in retirement and secret.

Every fifty years since the seventeenth century the same event has been celebrated with pageant, and ceremony, and the gift of a new posthumous name to the great founder; but railroad, electricity, modern invention, and modern organization have, for the first time, contributed to the greatness of this year's celebration. Has the religious significance of the occasion advanced in the same degree?

Curious to know what the great scholars (Ph.D.'s from Germany, Litt.D.'s, famous preachers) and contemplative students of the doctrine, as well as the common people, would answer to that question, I went to hear some eight addresses in the city hall, and came away each night more and more impressed with the power of *resistance* still remaining in the Jōdō and allied sects, as well as more than ever convinced that the noble truth which they have all but grasped can become truly vital only when more completely severed from India than is possible to any faith that branches from Buddhist stock.

According to Japanese custom, the most drawing speaker was kept for the last; but the audience, which was fully half priests, listened with interest from the beginning.

The first speaker chose to speak on "Four Aspects of Memorials for the Dead." It was a timely topic; for many

people are ridiculing Buddhism as a mere convenience for the burial of the dead, whose use for the living is *nil*.

Appearing in the regulation priestly garb, he said, for substance, that these oft-despised memorials for the dead were of immense value to the living.

First, because they not only showed but nourished gratitude, a sentiment without which a human heart was no better than a beast's. He claimed that the patriotism for which Japan was noted was not a racial trait, but a gift of religion, mainly through these ceremonies; since through the gratitude they induced they were an invaluable bond of national cohesion. "To leave the dead to oblivion is to cut off our own root."

In the second place, these memorials were the means by which the *spirit* of the dead was inherited. How little weight was to be attached to the mere form, which, severed from the spirit, was hypocrisy, was illustrated by the act of one of the great teachers of ancient times. Invited to such a memorial, he went; but, being debarred in some way from appearing as a great teacher, he went dressed as a begging friar. The treatment accorded to him was contemptuous and rude in the extreme. Later he went again in his full regalia to the same house, and, being given the place of honor, had set before him a grand feast. He thereupon stripped off his rich clothes, which he placed on the cushion assigned to him, and, moving to a lower place, said: "I have given to the clothes the place and feast you prepared for them; now bring me what you think is good enough for me, as you did the last time I came."

In fact, the simpler feast was the better, if the difference in cost could be contributed in the name of the dead to comfort some needy mortal still alive.

In the third place, it made us conscious of the guardianship

of the dead. General Oku, as he walked among the cherry-blossoms of his garden, said that he was gathering strength which his ancestors were giving him.

The fourth aspect of these memorials that was worthy of attention was that they draw us into relation with the teaching of the wise dead. What wonder that in these days, when the tablets of the dead are so little honored, there is such disheartening corruption among the young? "Out of 800 pupils in one public school whom I questioned, and out of 500 in another, only 36 and 16 respectively were taught to worship the tablets of their ancestors." "We conclude, then, that only dependence on the past can insure a great future."

The next man chose a text from the sayings of Hōnen Shōnin, which the speaker said summed up his spirit, namely, "To read ten thousand books to tatters and not understand a single letter." He was dressed in European clothes, and wore about his neck the *kesa* of the sect. He summarized as follows the growth of Buddhist religion until Hōnen's great revolution:—

India, the home of Buddhism, was like a nursery of young trees. The wonderful message of Sakya Muni was appreciated; so that every word was hunted out and written down, and costly temples and ceremonies marked the honor due to him and his. This Buddhism of outward adoration was the earliest Buddhism introduced into Japan. Buddha was added with others to the list of Japanese gods. This was the Buddhism of the Nara capital prior to A.D. 800.

After India, China. China received Buddhism in a foreign tongue. Translation required interpretation, and led to infinite subtle argument, which brought the truth nearer to the *minds* of men. The tree had blossomed, but in China and in the Heian period (Kyoto was called Heian when first made

capital) of Japanese Buddhism only the fruitless flower, philosophy, had resulted. Shingon, Tendai, and the allied Chinese sects were of this nature, each stoutly (at times by force of arms) maintaining its view of the essence of all things, whether *mystery* or *power* or *greatness* or *Nothingness* or what.

Men's hearts failed them. Such subtleties had no power to comfort them, and the controversies which grew out of them, so far from staying the evils of the times, actually aggravated them by the violence, intrigues, and corruption of warring priests. "Into the midst of such irreligious religion came Hōnen, as Christ came to rebuke the scribes and Pharisees at Jerusalem." This was the introduction of the Kamakura, or Japanese, age of Buddhism, the *Fruition* of Sakya's work. No longer a mere cultus, nor a philosophy, but a living religion, affecting the whole nature to its depths, it was destined to grow in power till now, seven hundred years afterwards, Hōnen's influence is stronger than ever.

Benkyo Kajiō (A.B.), on "The Standard for the Choice of a Religion."

"There is religion everywhere where there is humanity, whether it be in a remote mountain fastness or a tiny island. African savages and Parisian scholars alike have some kind of religion. There is almost infinite variety in form, but in one thing unity — *the cry of the human to reach the superhuman*. Put in another form, The human frame is full of requirements, desires, lusts. The mind has corresponding aspirations, practically unlimited in extent — the desire to know, to possess, to be free, and the like. Contrasted with this great aspiration is the pitiful impotence of the person, limited by a body that demands constant fostering attention, and even so can never be satisfied — the problem of unlimited aspirations hopeless of realization.

"Rebellion of the spirit at the tyranny of the body is a plausible solution. It has been worked out to exhaustion. It will never be done better than by the great ascetics of India. They have demonstrated for all time that mere destruction of the body in the at-

tempt to deny its demands can never bring peace. Of that there is no hope but in the gift of the Infinite. The problem of religion is how to bring this supply from the Infinite. But there are many religions fitted in different degrees to serve this purpose. How shall we decide on the right one?

"All comparisons of value have to be in accordance with a standard of measure. Length, area, capacity, curvature, power, and so on have their standards—the foot, the acre, the peck, the degree, the horse-power, etc. Seeing, then, that all religions have the common object, what is the standard to apply in discovering their relative efficiency? That is implied in their object. What in religion puts frail humanity in possession of the infinite power? There are obviously three qualities essential: on the human side, ease; on the divine side, certainty; in the uniting power, rationality.

"Applying the standard, there is certainly nothing easier than *Nammu Amida Butsu*, given to us by Hōnen; and than the power of Amida's mercy there is nothing surer. Thus far we find ourselves corroborated by the amazing similarity of another great religion, Christianity; but on the next point we are directly opposed—in our favor. Christianity is not rational; while Jōdō is completely so.

"For we teach that the finite and the infinite meet in the tripartite soul—the reason, the emotions, and the will. These are the names of these faculties at their meeting-point, but in the finite soul they are perverted, and are named covetousness, anger, and foolishness (*ton jin chi*); while in the infinite they are glorified into enlightenment, calm, and mercy (*chi dan on*). This glorified character flows into the human through the meeting-place, the formula *Nammu Amida Butsu*.

"People bring the criticism that this leaving all to Amida makes believers irresponsible. This is not Jōdō doctrine. That teaches that if even the bad may through Amida be born, the good may become parents themselves. Through *Nammu Amida Butsu* we are born into instant peace, but that leads to growth in gratitude, and all its works."

The next speaker, Nakashima Kōshi, chosen to close one session, was a very popular preacher of the sect. Though he spoke in full priestly robes he was exceedingly colloquial. He said:—

"The time is late, and I must not take your attention long. My subject, as you see it posted before you, was to have been 'Nature and the Spirit of Gratitude.'

"For ten years I have been thinking of the approach of this

centennial, and the gratitude we ought to feel. I was studying for a way to express the exceeding worth and need of gratitude so that all could understand it. I was to have spent part of my time to-night on the value of the spirit of gratitude, and then I was going to turn to the discussion of whether it was natural or not. But you all know what it is, and you all ought to know how valuable it is; so I will turn at once to my conclusion, trying briefly to get some light and possibly to give some help on the question from my own experience.

"Now I may not be like other folks, in fact I know myself well enough to hope that I am a great deal worse than most people — especially you, ladies and gentlemen,—so I will not venture to argue, that because my experiences are human experiences, and you are human beings, your experiences must therefore be like mine. Far from it. But my experience, so far as it is worth anything, goes to show that the two virtues, mercy and piety, are different phases of the same thing, kindness; good-will towards one's inferiors, and good-will towards one's superiors; and that the latter is the more difficult. Why, even cats and dogs have mercy on their young.

"I am not myself the happy possessor of children: I do not know from experience what fatherhood is. But I have parents just as well as any man, so I am fit to study one side of the question. I cannot remember what I thought of my parents when I was born. It is of a time four or five years later that I have my first recollection. At that time father was somewhat dreadful, but mother was dear. Away from her side I felt lonesome. So I had kindness toward her at least; but, even so, a clearer recollection shows that it was not she but myself that I thought of. There was no true gratitude. Of course I learned later that I owed obligation, but that was the gift of religion. I have noticed that other people cried more over the death of a child than that of a parent who had reached a 'ripe old age.' Thus in my case surely, and apparently in those of all the people I can see, gratitude is not natural. Being unnatural, is it therefore not worth while?

"There is a good deal said and written these days about following nature. Naturalism is rampant; and if all this is true, perhaps we shall have to follow nature and let gratitude go. But, for one, I am not an unqualified admirer of everything that is natural. I have heard of a good deal that was hideous and vile that was at the same time natural. Take the body, for instance. Its perfectly natural condition requires a considerable modification — does it not? — with its rheum from the eyes, mucous from the nose, wax from the ears — and plenty else. I have seen a girl all painted and powdered and fluffed and puffed, and a good girl too, who did not

eat meat, whose breath, nevertheless, was rank with onions. That was quite natural. Once I went up Fuji. I wore regulation dress — not the regulations of the temple, but the regulations of Fuji — white shirt, white drawers, and one of those great pilgrim hats that tie this way under the chin. Well, as my legs are not good, I got a coolie to help me, and I sweat and he sweat and got rained on, and I sweat some more, for twenty-four hours, and then got on the train for home at Gotemba — third-class of course — but even there you ought to have seen the passengers shy off from me. I suspected that they found the aroma a bit oppressive, but I did not do it on purpose — it was wholly natural. Any way you want to fix it, nature does need some guidance in the care of the body; and I have known some very natural states of *mind* that were unclean, to say the least.

“No: there is no need to reject a good thing, like gratitude for instance, simply because it is not natural.

“I would not want to disregard nature altogether. I would train it until sanctified human nature found it natural to conform to the higher nature of Buddha, when it is natural to feel gratitude and we shall have reached Nirvana. But till then, we are told, the discipline of the mortal and the immortal are different. We have to ‘plod the Bodai road for seventy years’ to reach that goal, that land of ease.

“By the formula *Nammu Amida Butsu* we can get the help of Amida to cure our ungrateful nature. How? Amida has no need of the difficult, wasteful, upward-reaching gratitude: all is beneath, where mercy flows naturally. Amida is so high that the downward glance of mercy spreads out infinitely wide. As we are raised aloft by this mercy of Amida’s, we are grateful for it; and that carries us still higher, till the narrowing circle above us, where ingratitude appears, gives place to the widening circle beneath us, where all at last will be included in our mercy also. This is the beneficent influence of the *Nammu Amida Butsu*, *Nammu Amida Butsu*.”

With the exception of the very long address by Dr. Anezaki, the speeches may be thus dismissed with a few extracts each.

Nakashima’s second address closed with the following:—

“Our Jōdō teaching does not belle the mercy of Amida. That is free for all who properly call upon it, in or out of Jōdō; but just as a lad, even with plenty of books, and brains to comprehend them, cannot in the home circle, where there are distractions and confusion, to say nothing of the noises of the street and the calls of

playmates, educate himself, but can readily do so when given the quiet, apparatus, discipline, and intelligent oversight of the school-room, so Jōdō comes into the confused world, where, though the duty of every one is fixed, the confusion and distraction are so great that no one can meet the call of duty; and, coming, gives to each the help he needs — furnishes the chance to receive Amida's mercy."

"Two Views of the 'Adoration'" was the topic of a tall and uncouth monk in the robes of his sect. His manner and dialect were as uncouth as his appearance. He said:—

"There is contrast in everything, heat and cold, light and shadow, good and bad, austerity and — the Gion quarter, where it is, 'Welcome, My Lord This! Welcome, Minister That! Welcome, welcome, Governor The Other [giving the names of three men of world-wide fame]. Welcome to joys, and joys alone.'

"So our holy formula of adoration, *Nammu Amida Butsu*, has its two sides.

"One is the scholarly side. There is great depth of meaning in it. Of course, a big-bodied, small-headed chap like me could not master that (though if my big body is my own overeating, I fancy the small head is more my parents' fault than mine).

"I have tried to read some books — mostly Chinese old-fashioned things — but I only got the meaning of about a sentence in each. I heard some folks say, *Nammu Amida Butsu* has a very wonderful meaning. *Nammu* means 'the infinite.' Oh, to grasp that! The infinite, think of it! *A* is the great circle of the universe; *Nammu A* is the infinite great circle of the universe; and the next syllable, *mi*, is the universe at work, revealing its power in phenomena — harnessed up, you know; while *da* means put to rights again, back to the infinite poise, home with the dinner-pail — for you wouldn't have the universe degraded to unremitting toil, would you? *Nammu Amida Butsu*! How lofty and beatific the poise of the mind that can utter the meaning of these words! For him bliss is assured. But where is that man? Not here, not in this frail body, nor in this world of change. No; we must forego forever the joys of Amida, were we compelled to grasp the truth. But, thanks be! the name of Amida calls him to our aid, and we know each other by communing. Amida rejoices to hear the cry, knows himself called; his soul draws nigh; we, rejoicing in the blessed sound of our own voices pronouncing 'Amida,' are drawn upward in the formula till we meet — we to lose all the ills of life of self and pass beyond the barrier of bliss."

Dr. Watanabe, with his German degree, appeared dressed in the robes of a Jōdō monk. He had little to say, and said it awkwardly. Unlike his predecessor, his awkwardness did not drop off like a mask and give place to fervent eloquence when he had amused his audience long enough. His subject was, "The Formula of Adoration." He spoke of the growth in seven hundred years from a little, weak sect to a great body that could assemble two hundred thousand pilgrims in one place.

"Why am I willing to occupy my time with a simple and plain discussion of this simple though blessed adoration? Because it was the very life-breath of the sage, Hōnen Shōnin, whom we celebrate, and because he himself urged the discussion of it where believers are gathered together.

"We do not need to fash our brains and waste our happiness in despair over this. To utter it with or without knowledge is the same. The Greater Vehicle and the Smaller both adore Amida. But with us it is not the discipline of comprehension of the Buddha, but the simple uttering of the six words, *Nam-mu-A-mi-da-Butsu*. For Hōnen's object was not to puzzle the already confused people with new difficulties, but to meet directly the demand of their nature.

"He himself called for its consoling repetition at his deathbed.

"This formula is not one whose efficacy is limited by the reach of reason. No: it is broader and farther reaching, because beyond reason. It does not depend on the will. It is not volitional adoration. Human resolution is too weak to accomplish what man's nature demands. The *Nammu Amida Butsu* accomplishes this without such futile effort."

Inouye Tokujiro, an elderly and refined monk, in choice and beautiful language, spoke of "The Sage's Poetry":—

"This is an age of superstition. It can well pause to think of the poem,—

'Where the rainbow road leads there is strange shadow about.'

There is no great light without its shadow. How true this is of the present so-called civilized age!

"Take that other poem of his,—

'The songs of our Japanese people show their hearts.'

Does not the purity of the songs he left us condemn the vile sensuality of our day, when a school-girl can publish such erotic stuff as this, . . . like a common harlot?

"The following is a song of true love:—

'When I hear the calling of the *uguisu*¹ for its mate
My own *Gombel*² is not here.'

That is not a yearning for some strange *Gombel*, some one else's *Gombel*. It is the true wife or the loyal widow's cry.

"Then Japanese poetry has been too apt to be plaintive. Enko's [another name for Hōnen] is happy.

"There was no grudge-bearing in his heart, as is shown by his verse. How beautifully free from that is the one he composed to the Emperor who exiled him.

'Though under false accusation I am exiled from your side,
We shall meet in heaven.'

The choice event of the whole series was Dr. Anezaki's long address on "The Influence of Hōnen Shōnin." He spoke nearly three hours, occupying the closing ninety minutes of two successive evenings. In substance he said as follows:—

A glance at contemporaneous history is necessary to measure the man and his influence. There has been no period of Japanese history fraught with greater changes than the period when he spent his eighty years on earth.

The Taira house went down from the pinnacle of its impudent vainglory. This was political change; but it meant as well war, confusion, breaking of families, death, poverty, a life of fear. At the same time nature added the terror of a fearful earthquake, which aroused the dread lest the end of the world had come. Lofty fame tumbled; mean men rose.

Religion had been lulled by the luxury of the Taira period. Monks had gone to quarreling for influence and favor, and had sacrificed their charges for lucre. But this had brought the inevitable change. Temples, even, were ruthlessly burned, not only in the wars of the Taira, but also by the quarreling monks them-

¹The *uguisu* is a sweet-voiced bird.

²*Gombel* is a very homely given name.

selves. The terrible depression of the times included all things,—material, political, religious.

It was reflected in the very poems. The vanity of all things was the theme borne in upon all serious minds.

Suffering so terrible, and fears so constant, demanded a solace beyond the power of man to take away, and so beyond the power of man to give. Hōnen's was the voice to proclaim it. The ills of this life no man can escape. There is left but the sure and sufficient mercy of Amida. We cannot raise ourselves, but, not only desiring to escape, we must *hate* with sincere hatred the bad and seek the better, when from above we may be saved.

More than one heart had already put its yearnings into the form of a hope in such verses as —

"The beauty of the wistaria proclaims to the believing eye the purple of Paradise."

But these betrayed rather the unfulfilled aspirations than the proclamation of established faith. Hōnen brought it from the vague into the distinct. He was not the product of the age, but found in himself—or rather received from Heaven—what the age was crying for.

We must not surround him, though, with any mythical, super-human origin. He was a man. Amida, Sakya, and Hōnen were all born but men, and what they became was by growth and struggle. With a truly human founder, Jōdō must not let itself be led into the opposed superstition. He never claimed to rest upon his own power, but to have received it. He modestly gave the glory to the Infinite. He threw away his personal greatness. Not that it ceased to exist,—it ceased to be *his*, but was ever stewarded for the glory of Amida. It fed no ambition, was sacrificed for others. His scholarship was still undiminished—in the service of those whom Amida sent to him. Hear him exult: "Among the flowers, Amida and I. When the snow flies, I pronounce his name, and sin and snow together depart."

Hōnen taught that believing without attaining to the object of belief was of no use. Though both good and bad are saved only through faith, yet the good is better than the bad. This impartiality which he described in Amida was a reflection of (or reflected in?) his own character. Welcome to his consoling presence were good and bad, rich and poor, wise and simple. In this he was like Sakya Muni also.

As Amida saves all who come to him in faith, no other act is relevant, he taught. When asked, for instance, whether the prayer of the educated was more efficacious than that of the ignorant, he said, "The pupil has no better chance than his master." When

asked whether the eating of fish would hinder or help prayer, he answered, that neither the cormorants, that gorge themselves on fish, nor the monkeys, that eschewed it, seemed nearer heaven for that. This was like Buddha, who said, "If ablutions were a means of salvation, the mud-turtles were the farthest on the road." And I want to digress to warn some of you that there is no more reason to expect salvation by shaving the head (or to be ashamed of a shaven head, either, if you will do your duty as monks) than there is to honor bald-headed melons and cucumbers above hairy maize — or the reverse, since personal faith is, in this or any age, the only standard for the followers of Buddha and Hōnen. Hōnen's indirect influence in his own time was very great. Even the half-savage men of the northern provinces, who knew little but his name, were ready to lay down their lives fighting for it.

But his direct influence was very broad in the quality as well as the number of his disciples. Men who were then, or became afterwards, the very leaders of their sects, came to him to learn, while others were taught by his questions to take a new outlook on life. Shinran [the founder of Shin, the most popular of all the Buddhist sects] was his faithful disciple, and perhaps represented the master's aspirations better than circumstances permitted the master himself to do.

Rank being the basis of our country's society, it is necessary to an understanding of his influence to state that men of the highest station learned of him the peace of Amida. Among them were three emperors. Of the very household of the Taira's, Kiyomori's son, burdened with crime, even to temple-burning, and a prisoner of war; when he thus again met Hōnen, in his tears at last gave him serious attention, and, hopeless, despairing, weary of life, received the comfort which bore him in fortitude to the block, and in peace to his end.

Many doubtless came to him led by curiosity and fashion; but there were sincere ones, beyond doubt. The warrior Kumagaya retired from a place of high command, and lived in peace at Kurodani, where, in the presence of a crowd of adoring priests gathered in answer to his summons, he passed away.¹

Another warrior was led by Hōnen, not to leave his work, but to achieve in it. Another, true, in the retirement of the monastery, to his warrior traditions, impatient at death's delay, sought the

¹ Kumagaya, after living as a monk for many years, announced that he would depart to glory on a certain day in February, and asked all who wished to witness a translation to be present. Crowds came, and had chanted the *Nammu Amida Butsu* for hours, when Kumagaya announced that his soul was still too bur-

blessing by *kara-kiri*, and, after cleaning with his own hand the results of his act, peacefully lingered several days, to a peaceful end. They were not, as you see, only the aged and weary on the brink of dissolution, but the strong as well, who came to him for guidance.

One needs to read the "Tales of the Taira House" [*Heike Monogatari*] to understand Hōnen, and without him they are, in turn, insipid.

Among his followers he numbered sorcerers and soothsayers, even murderers. They were saved by him with perfect impartiality.

Mercy to be true must show itself in evangelism. Did Hōnen pass this test? To be sure, he never left Kyoto till he was seventy-four years old (for the tradition of his trip to Tokyo is not trustworthy), but his followers went everywhere, which shows the effect of his teachings. But there is evidence that they went at his command and in his name. In any case, that which they imbibed from him sent them. When asked where he would have his head-shrine, he said, "Everywhere that the cry to Amida is heard." I thought at the great ceremony to-day, that, however others may content themselves with sitting quietly down about the fifty-five sacred spots where the soil he trod is distributed, that is not where they will commune with the spirit of Hōnen Shōnin.

When banished to Shikoku, without rancor he sang,—

"Though falsely accused I am exiled from you
I will meet you in Paradise."

He lived through the changes of a wonderful age, and was privileged to return, in his eightieth year, to die in peace in Kyoto.

Only sixty years passed before another great spirit arose to adorn Buddhism. I may offend you by turning to this subject; for Nichiren has been considered by the Jōdō sect the arch-enemy. But if I know the spirit of Hōnen, he himself would not object to being mentioned along with him.

The two men taught different doctrines and lived very different lives, but both came, in answer to the need of the times, to proclaim, in the name of Buddha out of their common mercy, the truth as they saw it. The parallel of mild St. Francis and turbulent dened to rise; so that his departure would be deferred till September. Frankly taking him at his word, a new assembly were on hand on the second date, and this time there was no disappointment, for just before sunset the soul was seen to issue like a flame from his mouth, and join the heavenly glory that came in a purple cloud to meet it.

Vol. LXIX. No. 273. 8

St. Dominic embracing in tears on the porch of the Lateran might well be enacted for our own great saints by their followers to-day.

We have our sword, mirror, and crystal ball—the strong, the pure, the perfect—among the sacred treasures of our land. In the history of Buddhism we may well treasure Nichiren, Denkyo daishi, and Hōnen as equally necessary and inseparable in a rounded religious history.

The peaceful life of Hōnen was strangely unlike that of Nichiren, of whom the song says:—

“While birds and beasts cry without tears,
Nichiren cried not, but had no respite of tears”—

glad tears and sorry tears.

One of them [Hōnen] said: “You cannot go down a deep well without a rope, nor fly unless wings are given you.” The other taught: “The pine lifts its own head up as well as Mount Fuji,” teaching the two truths of dependence on mercy, and personal responsibility.

Friends, these things happened seven hundred years ago. Are they having their due influence to-day? We are not back in the days of the terrible Genpei struggle, with all we have seen it to mean; but there is scarcely less of a crisis upon us now. Our social order is disturbed by rationalism, by materialism, by naturalism, by socialism, and by strife. Buddhism seems again to have fallen into the sloth of ease and into corruption. Is not this true of Jōdō—aye, of Jōdō especially. I am not a judge over you or any man. I speak only what I believe. The family—why a famous lawyer has said that there is scarcely an ideal home anywhere. This is but one of the places where we are in danger.

Character is defective, especially in sincerity.

Our schools are not working in accordance with the spirit of the rescript, which they profess to teach.

Religion itself—is the spirit of Hōnen to be found in the activity of Jōdō?

If I am allowed, in closing, to prescribe for our time, I should say, There are three prime needs: (1) perfect truth—in the sense of sincerity and honesty; (2) deep faith—faith in character, faith in others, and faith in ideals; (3) consecration—of all one is, and has, to society for the Infinite's sake. Are you and I doing our part to create these things?

Coming out, such remarks as the following were heard in the lobby: “Sounds like a Christian, doesn't it?” “Yes, he's a fair-minded person.”

ARTICLE VIII.

THE MINISTRY OF PAIN.

BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., WUCHANG, CHINA.

I.

DESPITE the recent great increase of comforts and luxuries in civilized lands, the amelioration of poverty, the wonderful alleviation of physical pain and suffering by the resources of modern medicine and surgery, the steady reduction of sickness in the aggregate, and the declining death-rate, the problem of pain and sorrow still presses heavily on the minds of men, causing many to drift from their religious moorings. Of the late Sir Leslie Stephen, at one time a clergyman, it is said that he was a rebel against pain, not on his own account, for he stood his own trials well, but in a Promethean man-loving spirit. It was the sight of the world's tragedy which made him an agnostic. Unquestionably, there is a vast amount of suffering in the world, the contemplation of which at times strains the faith of even the sturdiest believer in the good Providence of God. There are the calamities of nature, — the storms, shipwrecks, fires, earthquakes, droughts, famines, inundations, pestilences, the numerous diseases and accidents, — which collectively destroy millions of human beings every year, and make life a burden to countless others. There are also man's deliberate cruelty to man, his cruelty to the lower animals, and the deadly and incessant struggle between all forms of life for bare existence, which has been going on for ages to such a degree that some evolutionists describe the world as one great battle-field heaped with the slain, an in-

ferno of infinite suffering and slaughter, resounding with the cries of ceaseless agony.

Further, there are the miseries of man's social life.

"What mischiefs still haunt the world to which our eyes are yet hardly open; what tragedies lie hid beneath the most brilliant society; what miserable and hopeless masses of life are covered by the roofs of a great city; how in dumb and silent anguish hearts are looking out every morning for good that never comes, and arms are stretched in vain for help that no one knows how to give; how, in the highest public prosperity, doubt and suffering, barbarism untamable and unconquered, never cease to cross its path and affront its pride; how the brightest life, the keenest intellectual power, is at the mercy of the irreparable stroke,—the catastrophe, the bereavement, the life-long madness or palsy, the pang that cannot be charmed."

There are also the spiritual woes of mankind, of which Newman gives a daring summary:—

"the just overcome, the aged failing; the sophistry of misbelief, the wilfulness of passion, the obduracy of pride, the tyranny of habit, the canker of remorse, the wasting fever of care, the anguish of shame, the pining of disappointment, the sickness of despair; such cruel, such pitiable spectacles, such heart-rending, revolting, detestable, maddening scenes; the haggard faces, the convulsed lips, the flushed cheek, the dark brow of the willing victims of rebellion. It is the long history of a world, and God alone can bear the load of it."

For various reasons the problem of suffering seems much more distressing to us than it was to our forefathers. They believed that man, created happy and innocent, of his own free will and choice fell into ways of evil, and so brought sorrow to himself and all his descendants. The wide and far-reaching consequences were not deemed unjust. But the evolutionist recognizes no federal head of the race upon whom he can lay the blame for all its misery. He knows that pain and death have been in the animal world for æons before man appeared, and that mankind itself has been struggling and suffering for a vast period of time, compared with which the

period covered by our records seems very short indeed. He cannot but be compassionate and feel indebted to those remote ancestors who laid the deep foundations of our civilization, applying to them the apostrophe of Carlyle to the toiler in the field:—

“Venerable to me is the hard hand; crooked, coarse; wherein lies notwithstanding a cunning virtue, indefeasibly royal, as of the scepter of this planet. Venerable, too, is the rugged face, all weather tanned, besotted, with its rude intelligence; for it is the face of a man living manlike. O! but the more venerable for thy rudeness, and even because we must pity as well as love thee! Hardly intreated brother! For us was thy back so bent, for us were thy straight limbs and fingers so deformed: thou wert our conscript, on whom the lot fell, and fighting our battles wert so marred. For in thee too lay a god-created form, but it was not to be unfolded; encrusted must it stand with the thick adhesions of labor; and thy body, like thy soul, was not to know freedom.”

Again, our forefathers were ignorant of much of the suffering of the world which existed beyond their own borders, and, if the truth must be told, if they had known, would not have been so distressed by it as those are to whom the solidarity of the race is no mere figure of speech. In our day we cannot be ignorant or indifferent; for the crimes, misfortunes, and miseries of all mankind are incessantly forced upon the attention by current literature and socialistic movements.

Further, the knowledge acquired in our day of the long history of the race and its distressingly slow moral ascent, has undermined the hope of a speedy deliverance from the woes which afflict mankind, due to selfishness and sin, unless there shall be a spiritual movement far stronger than the world has ever yet seen. The results of the thousands of years of disciplinary suffering through which the race has passed seem so insignificant when the life of the average man is considered, with its poor performances and short duration, that many are becoming doubtful of the whole purpose of

life, and are asking, Is the end, whatever it may be, worth all the pain which must be borne in order to reach it?

Thus the past, the present, and the future, all seem fraught with sorrow, and men are losing faith and hope. On the ground that so much misery cannot be consistent with the existence of a God of infinite love and power, either the reality of pain is denied, as among the Christian Scientists; or it is not admitted that the Being who manifests himself in this misery-stricken world and in the sin-stained life of man, if he does so manifest himself, can be both all-powerful and utterly good. "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith upon the earth?" Perhaps the outlook is really not so somber. May be we are all in the period of depression, which lies between great spiritual advances, "between the years," as the prophet Habakkuk expresses it.

Before proceeding to deal directly with our subject, to provide an historical background, it may be worth while to glance briefly at the various ways in which different philosophies and religions have dealt with this central problem of the existence of evil and pain.

Among savage races, religion may be said to begin definitely with Naturism, the worship of its vague, unknown powers or influences working for evil rather than for good; and Animism, the worship of spirits accredited to plants, animals, and even inanimate things. All pain, sorrow, and misfortune are ascribed to the hostile influences or spirits, and it is sought to appease or propitiate them by witchcraft and magic. As it is the mind which invests pain with most of its intensity, and barbaric people can hardly have the mental power to ponder deeply on the problems of life, and as they do not feel any inalienable right to happiness, evil to them is not the

standing problem which it becomes to those of more advanced civilization.

The ancient Egyptians believed that pain and grief were sent by their gods, and the charms and incantations for banishing it were based on the notion of frightening the god who caused the trouble by the terrors of a more powerful divinity under whose protection the sufferer was placed, or with whom he was identified. The goddess Isis was the great enchantress who delivered men from their woes by her power over the other gods. But she herself was sorely afflicted by the murder of her husband, whose scattered remains she gathered and buried with lamentation. In fact, all the gods, even Ra the sun-god, were supposed to suffer, as does mankind, from hunger, thirst, disease, old age, fear, and sorrow; they could be stung by reptiles, and burned by fires; they shrieked and howled in their affliction. Suffering was universal. Egyptian religion reached its highest point in the adoration of Aten, the personification of the light, warmth, and fructifying energy of the sun, but scientific theism, of which this is the beginning, can give no heart-satisfying solution of the problem of pain.

The Assyrians and Babylonians feared the powers of Nature, and the demons that produced sickness and pain. The baneful influence of each demon required the services of an exorcist to counteract it. They believed also there were good and mighty spirits, able to control the powers of evil in answer to the prayers of men. But the justice of the gods now begins to be questioned. Five centuries before the time of Moses, in a prayer to the goddess Istar, an Assyrian king complains:—

“In what have I sinned against thee?

Why hast thou allotted me diseases, boils, and pestilence?

Is this thy just decree?

If I have not committed sin and evil why am I thus smitten?
In my foundations I am unloosened,
I am broken in pieces, and rest I find not
On the throne of my kingdom."

Brought up in Ur of the Chaldees, Abraham's faith in a righteous God who is the shield and reward of those who put their trust in him, seems so immeasurably higher than the religion of his countrymen that it can be regarded only as a positive revelation. It was no childish or slavish faith, for he dared to doubt the justice of God, when it seemed as if the innocent and the guilty were to be indiscriminately overwhelmed in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

In Zoroastrianism all pain and evil is ascribed to the evil deity Ahriman and his agents the wicked devas. Sickness was treated by magic spells and religious ritual. The hope of the deliverance of the world from evil now finds utterance. In an old hymn of the Parsee liturgy, the soul of nature is represented as appearing before God and complaining that the world was devastated by the evil one. It begs for the creation of a being powerful enough to release it forever from its affliction. The Gnostics, Manichæans, and others also believed in the existence of an evil deity, the author of all the evil in the world.

To the Greeks and Romans, with their love of physical beauty and vigor, all pain was repulsive, a physical degradation; hence the gospel of a crucified Redemer was to them foolishness. In a spirit of proud self-reliance, they sought to form in the inner life a spiritual citadel, where they could dwell impregnable to the assaults of pain and misfortune.

The Epicureans regarded happiness as the end of life, and happiness was held to be a body free from pain, and a mind released from all perturbation. They did not think the gods troubled themselves about human affairs, for if they did, it

would make them unhappy; but it was plain they did not, as there was so much misery in the world. Everything happens according to nature. When this is realized, the mind is liberated from all superstitious fears, and from the fear of pain and death. If pain is severe, it does not last long; if it lasts long, it is rarely intolerable. Death is nothing, since when we are, death is not; and when death is, we are not. The best among the Epicureans sought to attain this spiritual freedom by moderation in the indulgence of the passions, clearness of intellectual vision, nobility of sentiment, and the avoidance of all care. Among the baser sort, the philosophy degenerated into the low conception that the enjoyment of animal pleasures is the chief end of life.

The Stoics believed that law, inherent and indestructible, governed the world, and tried to submit to its necessities with a free spirit. The evils of the world were the secondary consequences of its development, and only had power over those who ascribed reality to them. "It is not things that disquiet us, but our opinions about things." The aim of life is to preserve the divinity within from injury and disgrace, and to rise superior to pain and pleasure. Pain cannot be avoided, but it can be borne without wincing, and in an equable spirit. Men are to be like skilful ball-players who care not for the ball whether it is good or bad, but only about the manner of throwing and catching it. It was thus, said Epictetus, that Socrates played with the ball when about to die. "What was the ball that was there thrown about among them? Life, chains, exile, a draught of poison, to be torn from a wife, to leave children orphans. These were the things among them that they played withal; yet none the less did he play, and fling the ball with proper grace and measure. And so should we do also, having the carefulness of the most zealous players, and

yet indifference as it were merely about a ball." If pain or sorrow became unendurable, one could escape by "the open door," that is, by suicide.

According to the Chinese sages, man is born good, but goes astray from want of instruction and practical help from his superiors, and because of his own restless desires. Hence his misery, which is increased by the punishments which Heaven sends to call him to repentance.

"How great is God who ruleth man below!
In awful terrors now arrayed,
His dealings seem a recklessness to show
From which we shuddering shrink dismayed.
But men at first from Heaven their being drew,
With nature liable to change.
All hearts in infancy are good and true,
But times and things these hearts derange."

As the Confucianists expect no divine help in the work of human redemption, they seem to have little hope of bringing in the golden age of the past, to which they look back so wistfully. On the top of a high mountain with an extensive view, Confucius was moved to exclaim:—

"Standing on an elevation like this, one looks over, as it were, the whole world; and, alas! alas! as I do so, I can not help being struck with the sad fact that of the myriads who live in it, there is scarcely one man to be found who is not devising some means by which he may injure or destroy his neighbor. That in itself is sad enough. But there is something still sadder. It is to be so helpless and incapable, that even when we wish to do so, we can neither find remedies for existing evils, nor some way of warding off these which are about to come."

The problem of pain from the Chinese point of view is insoluble.

The Buddhist regards pain as an adversity, to be evaded by giving it no possible hold. It was the sight of sickness, old age, and death, which made the founder of this religion leave his palace on a pilgrimage to find the means by which man

could cross the ocean of life and make an end of sorrow. As the result of his labors and thought, he promulgated the four noble truths: (1) existence is only pain and sorrow; (2) the cause of pain and sorrow is desire; (3) in Nirvana all pain and sorrow cease; (4) the way to Nirvana is by the eightfold path of virtuous self-discipline, ending in ecstatic oblivion of self-consciousness.

The Hindu reflecting on the mutability and evanescence of material things seeks for the one permanent Substance underlying them all, the Being that is and never changes, which can become to him an enduring object of trust,—

“Some life continuous, Being unimpaired,
That hath been and is, and where it was and is,
There shall endure,—an Existence unexposed
To the blind walk of mortal accident:
From diminution safe, and weakening age,
While man grows old, dwindles and decays,
And countless generations of mankind depart,
And leave no vestige where they trod.”

Emancipation from the illusions, entanglements, and evils of the world is to be accomplished by the rigorous and holy contemplation of this enduring Existence. The dangerous weakness of Pantheism is its tendency to regard the evil and distressing things of life as manifestations of the deity equally with the good, and therefore, logically, if the deity is unchangeable, there can be no hope of deliverance.

The Jews considered all suffering was sent by God as a punishment for disobedience, angels of various powers and degrees being his ministers. By strict obedience to the moral and ceremonial law it was thought man might win the favor of God, of which exemption from affliction would be the proof. When it was perceived that the good did not escape suffering it caused great perplexity. This forms the subject of the book of Job, which offers four answers to the question Why do

the good suffer? (1) Suffering is a test of saintship, made the more severe as the saintship is strong to endure; (2) All suffering is judgment upon sin, though the sin is not always manifest; (3) Suffering is judgment, warning the sinner by repentance to escape from heavier judgment; (4) The whole universe is an unfathomed mystery, and the evil in it is not more mysterious than the good and great. Thus no complete solution is given, but the attitude of one who has the bold faith to appeal to God against the seeming injustice of God's own visitations, is declared to be more acceptable to Him than the servile adoration of those who would distort the facts in order to magnify Him.¹

The Christian religion, according to its Founder, teaches that the moral evil proceeding from the hearts of men brings woeful consequences; and that here is also a kingdom of evil in the dark background of human life presided over by the spirit of the world, which adds to the world's sorrow. Suffering is therefore mainly due to sin, but not necessarily to the sufferer's own sin. The chief good to be sought in this present life is not freedom from pain but freedom from sin, and the establishment of the Kingdom of God in this world. Those who follow Christ are to expect tribulation; but it will not, or need not, affect harmfully their spiritual life. All suffering of every kind is known to the Father, without whose knowledge not even a sparrow falls to the ground, and who will in his own good time vindicate the justice and wisdom of his Providence. The cup of sorrow is to be taken in a spirit of loving submission, and so taken, it brings with it heavenly rewards.

According to the Mohammedans, God is the Eternal who created all things and predestinated all things both good and

¹ Moulton.

bad. He has decreed, and no one can shun or escape his decree. Submission is therefore the whole of religion. While the premise may not be accepted, the conclusion, though it does not wholly satisfy, does state a great truth. Says Carlyle:—

“Islam means that we must submit to God, that our whole strength lies in resigned submission to him, whatsoever He do to us. It has ever been held the highest wisdom for a man, not merely to submit to necessity—necessity will make him submit, —but to know and believe well that the stern thing which necessity had ordered was the wisest, the best, the thing wanted there; to cease his frantic pretension of scanning this great God’s world in his small fraction of a brain; to know that it had verily, though deep beyond his soundings, a just law; that the soul of it was good; that his part in it was to conform to the law of the whole, and in the devout silence follow that; not questioning it, obeying it as unquestionable. This is the soul of Islam; it is properly the soul of Christianity; for Islam is definable as a confused form of Christianity; had Christianity not been, neither had it been. Christianity also commands us, before all, to be resigned to God.”

The object of the present paper is to try to show the importance of pain as a factor in the evolution of life, physical, mental, moral, and spiritual; that it has been a blessing, not a curse. Whether it was not possible to accomplish the same ends without pain is a question no one can answer. But suffering being accepted as a law of life, in the same way that we recognize gravitation to be a law of the physical world, its beneficent effects can be traced, though the problem cannot be solved completely. As this is a subject upon which the best and profoundest minds in all ages have written, — theologians, poets, scientists, philosophers, — not much that is original can be offered; and quotations, acknowledged and unacknowledged, are rather frequent. With the hope that it may be more helpful, the paper is written from the point of view of the evolutionist, yet with the full belief that Chris-

tianity, with its recognition of the solidarity of all living creatures, and its emphasis on the glory of vicarious suffering, is the best solution yet vouchsafed to us of the problem of pain.

1. *Pain is the price paid for the fullness and security of physical life.*

It is often asked, Why is it not possible to have life without pain? To answer the question completely would require a knowledge of all that is in the mind of God. But sufficient is known of the ways of Providence to justify our faith in its goodness and wisdom; our lack of complete knowledge need not put us to confusion. As a matter of fact, in the simplest form of life there can be little or no pain, for these organisms possess just enough sensation to enable them to avoid what is unattractive, and to move towards their food. They do not, as far as we know, suffer from disease; they reproduce their kind without pain or danger; they are immortal, unless killed by violence. But their correspondence with the outside world is very limited and feeble. Now life itself has been defined as consisting of the action and reaction between an organism and its environment. The wider and more varied this is, the fuller is the life. As the increase of relation depends upon a corresponding increased complexity of structure, this is necessarily accompanied by greater vulnerability to derangement, that is, to pain, disease, and death. In ascending the scale of being, complexity of structure, fullness of life, and susceptibility to pain increase together. Hence the epigrams that in the morning of life "immortality was pawned for love," and that "death was the price paid for a body."

The study of the evolution of the nervous system of the lower animals makes this point clear; for all the varied sensations of the body have been developed from the sense of touch, with its inseparable accompaniment of pain on over-

stimulation. In unicellular organisms, sensation is diffused uniformly through the whole cell, and, as already stated, it is very feeble. In organisms slightly more advanced, a primitive skin makes its appearance to protect the organism from the buffetings of the outside world. As the skin is the part most subject to external stimuli, it is the part in which further developmental changes mainly proceed. Some of the external cells become modified, and by the growth of long processes from them, a conducting network is provided running through all parts of the body, thus affording a channel for the rapid propagation of sensation from the surface to the deeper parts, as well as from one part of the exterior to another. From this same outer layer are produced the cells which, as muscle fibres, act as the motive mechanism of the organ, thus forming the sensori-motor system, to which the other systems of the body — the respiratory, digestive, secretive, and circulatory — are subsidiary. From the beginning, therefore, the chief means of attack or escape in the struggle for existence were laid down in close connection with the exterior sensory area. A further step consists in the withdrawal of certain of the sensory cells from the surface to the deeper parts, to secure their protection. Here they form ganglia, each ganglion presiding over the part of the body in which it is located. A specially sensitive or irritable organ is thus evolved, which serves as a distributing center for the messages or calls to action, initiated by changes occurring at the surface of the body. In order that in the presence of pain or danger all the activities of the body can be quickly concentrated on the one common purpose of attack or defense, the part of this nervous system located in the head, which is usually the first to perceive changes in the environment, comes to be predominant over all other parts, which surrender their

independent functions to a great extent, and learn to respond instantaneously to its commands. This head center, or brain, eventually gathers to itself all pain and other sensation, and directs all the activities of the body for the welfare of the whole.¹ There is now, as in man, the complete nervous system, consisting of brain, nerves, and end organs, working together harmoniously; and the sense of touch in the skin was the starting-point of all their functions.

"The brain trillion-celled seat of sensation, all the subtle mechanism with which it controls the body; the organs of sense with their mysterious selective power; the olfactory organs, probably the earliest developed, so acute in man as to detect the presence of one-three billionth of a grain of mercaptan, and yet coarse by comparison with the antennae of insects; the eye to receive and sift vibrations traveling twelve million miles in a minute; the ear with its three thousand strings of Corti, each vibrating in response to a particular sound wave; the organs of taste guarding the entrance to the digestive canal and refusing admittance to contraband food,—all begin as sacs formed by infolding of the primitive skin."²

Throughout the whole course of this marvelous evolution, it is pain which by its warnings guards the body from injury when danger assails it, by prompting it to acts necessary for the maintenance and security of life. Many of these protective acts in time become instinctive, and as they are performed far more swiftly than the time it takes to think and

¹The relation of the head to the body, which St. Paul uses as an illustration of the relation of Christ to the church, is from this point of view most instructive. "Remember what to Paul the headship of Christ is; it is in the most literal sense the saving of the body. It is a reign no doubt over the members, but it is not a reign after the analogy of kingdom. It is in its deepest sense a priesthood of suffering. It is a mastership over the members which is reached by taking their pains, a pre-eminence which is achieved by accepting the lowest room" (Matheson, *The Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, p. 273).

² Clodd.

decide upon a course of action, they confer additional security. When all is considered, surely the susceptibility to pain is not too heavy a price to pay for the wonderful complexity and sensitiveness of the human body, and for its beauty, grace, and strength.

Sensation, with its liability to become pain on overstimulation, is not only necessary for the development and maintenance of life, by acting as a sentinel to guard the body from external injury, but it is also subtly connected with the harmonious interaction of the bodily functions which govern the nutrition of the tissues. Thus it is a striking fact that loss of sensation in a particular part of the body is often followed by the most marked trophic disorders there. Division or disease of the principal nerve of sensation of the face may lead to inflammation of the eye so severe as to end in its disintegration. Despite the greatest care, after injury to the spinal cord, in a few days large bedsores form, difficult or impossible to heal. Division of the pneumogastric nerves is followed by gangrene of the lungs. Disease of the nerves supplying a joint leads to disease of the joint itself. In short, loss of sensation predisposes to defective nutrition and consequent death of the tissues.

Conversely, when the life and multiplication of certain cells of the body become disorderly, as in cancer, there may be the greatest conceivable pain. The evil behavior of the cancer cells, which neither in structure nor in powers possess anything not found in healthy cells, is shown in their disproportionate multiplication; their imperfect, irregular, and useless differentiation; their insistent intrusion into surrounding tissues; their imperfect coöperation with the other cells of the body; and their selfish greed, which enables them to live when other cells are fasting and perishing for lack of nourishment.

"Cancer is not a disease attacking the body from without, it is a breach or failure of fundamental cell law, a law of which we know only the results; a law so majestic that obedience to it results in perfect development, perfect health, the full measure of days; and disobedience to it may slowly spell out all the inscrutable woes of cancer." Which things are a parable.¹

When the body has at last succumbed to disease or trauma—pain has still its beneficial uses. As an aid to diagnosis it is frequently of higher value than any other single symptom, for "every pain has its distinct and pregnant signification, if we will but search for it." In treatment it is of great value, as its presence is a sign that the healing process is not proceeding normally; and by preventing movement, it secures the necessary rest for an inflamed and injured part. This particular function has been graphically described in a classical work on surgery. Let us imagine, writes the author, the condition of our first parents when suddenly thrust out of the garden of Eden and doomed to toil for their daily bread; not knowing how to avoid local injury, and exposed to all the accidents of a precarious existence. With what awe-stricken dismay must man have regarded his first wound, his first experience of pain;—the breach of surface disclosing to his sight the flowing blood which he was unable to check, and then the sense of faintness induced by its loss, causing him to sink to the earth under the foretaste of death, with the recent denunciation, "thou shalt surely die," still ringing in his ears. Can words depict the hopeless anguish he must have endured? But what follows? Under the influence of the rest induced by pain, a clot forms, Nature stays the bleeding, and healing gradually takes place; and it is pain which compels him to keep the part at rest, so that the healing may proceed uninterruptedly.

¹ Gould.

"Every deviation from this necessary state of rest brought with it, through pain, the admonition that he was straying from the condition essential to its restoration. He must have observed with astonishment the breaking asunder of the newly formed tissue, or the steady development into normal tissue structure, which occurred in exact accordance with the disturbance or rest of the parts which the sense of pain enabled him to regulate so accurately, and to employ so beneficially for his own personal relief and comfort."¹

Of course, the subject has a dark side, which cannot be ignored. Physical pain may cause so much distress and exhaustion as to banish sleep, disturb appetite and digestion, and otherwise so interfere with the functions of the body, as to induce morbid changes which shorten existence. It may even be so continuous and intolerable as to drive men to commit suicide, and may itself be so intense as to be the direct cause of death. Nevertheless, it may be safely affirmed that, in comparison with the freedom from pain generally enjoyed, instances of unendurable pain are rare, and there are considerations which justify the opinion that pain, generally, is not so universal and severe as is commonly imagined. Sensation increases through a series of just perceptible differences. It starts from the zero of consciousness, becomes more intense as the stimulus increases up to the point where it is so strong as to begin to injure the nerve apparatus, when it becomes positive pain. The grades of sensation will be less numerous as the organization is of a coarser or lower order, and sensation itself will not be so keen. Even among human beings there are great differences in the reaction to pain. Probably most people nowadays would prefer to die of sickness, rather than be killed in battle, but it has not been always so. "What a shame," said the great Duke Sigeward of Northumberland, when dying of a lingering disease, "what a shame for me not

¹ Hilton.

to have been permitted to die in so many battles, — and to end thus by a cow's death. At least put on my breast-plate, gird on my sword, set my helmet on my head, my shield in my left hand, my golden battle axe in my right, so that a great warrior like myself may die as a warrior." In those days it was felt that a man who had never been wounded lived a weary life; and the conception then current of the happiness of heaven was desperate fighting during the day, and at night, with wounds all healed, feasting and other sensual pleasures.

It is certainly a fact that the condition of a sick or wounded person often seems to be far more distressing than it is actually.¹

Wounds received unexpectedly, as by accident or during warfare, do not seem to be attended by much immediate pain. The present writer has questioned many injured persons on this point, and the testimony is almost unanimous that at the moment the injury was inflicted little pain was felt. Then it is well known that soldiers often go on fighting, ignorant of their severe and apparently very painful wounds. The prolonged and deliberate infliction of pain on a conscious subject,

¹"A year later he was seriously ill of pneumonia, with various painful complications, and I find another note about his sensation written a few weeks after his recovery: I am told, (he says) that my sufferings were horrible to witness, and the nurse dwells particularly on my struggles for breath. Of those I was completely unconscious, and I am not aware of having even suffered discomfort in breathing. Other things were temporarily painful, but the memory of them has so far faded from my mind that it is scarcely to be weighed against the recollection of one sunny hour. The idea of pain is constantly before us because a few people out of a vast number are always suffering from accidents and diseases which are described in newspapers, or talked about by their friends. This produces the illusion that pain is a constant factor of everybody's life. It is, on the contrary, but a mere incident in the lives of the vast majority" (Quoted in Horton's "My Belief," p. 265).

as by the tortures of the Inquisition, is in another and more terrible category. But there is a merciful limit to human endurance. After a time, either the pain is not keenly felt, owing to the obtunding of all sensation, or else death gives relief. The continued progress of medicine and surgery will abolish more and more the pain of disease, and man's inhuman treatment of man will diminish as he becomes more loving and wiser.

In further confirmation of this view, of differences of level of the pain threshold, it is said that in idiots the sense of pain is so obtuse that they can hardly distinguish between heat and cold, and seem hardly to know what pain is. In their dull lives such pain as can be excited in them may literally be accepted with welcome surprise.¹ Therefore the stimulus which gives pain to a very sensitive human being is not to be taken as the measure of the suffering in less sensitive creatures. Within limits, it may be in them the stimulus exactly suited to call forth the latent powers of the organism. At any rate, those creatures which in the course of evolution shrank from pain and risk of death by taking refuge within a hard protective covering (as the echinoderm within its calcareous skin, the mollusk in its shell, the crustacean beneath its carapace, the ganoids within their heavy armor) were debarred from further progress, and many species became decadent or extinct.

But naturalists are almost unanimous in affirming there is very little prolonged pain among the lower animals in the wild, free state. Their worst sufferings come from contact with mankind, and these, inasmuch as it is generally believed there can be no possible compensation for them, are the cause of deep distress and moral perplexity to many minds. It is a partial solution of the mystery that animals advance or recede

¹ Galton.

in their qualities with the goodness and intelligence of man ; there is a solidarity sufficiently comprehensive to include even them. The shepherd-dog, trained to be the friend and intelligent companion of its owner, is a higher animal than the homeless, mangy scavenger of an Oriental city, or the wolf on the plains. It is on this ground of solidarity that all animals justifiably come under the law of vicarious suffering ; they as well as human beings must suffer and die for the good of the whole. The vivisection which tender-hearted people so strongly condemn, properly and mercifully performed, as it ought to be in every case, does not cause suffering, and the knowledge so acquired has been of such inestimable value to the human race, that it is well worth all that it has cost. The benefit gained is shared also by the lower animals. If such a terrible disease as hydrophobia is stamped out by human science, the lower animals are first saved from it. Further, with a glory and breadth of vision we hardly appreciate, the Bible points forward to a time when conflict and distrust between mankind and the lower animals shall completely disappear, and all shall share in a grand redemption. If they suffer with and for man, they will also share his blessings.

The last great enemy, death, which Aristotle declares to be of all things the most terrible, will always be with us, but it is an event not greatly to be feared because of its pain. It is said that people nowadays dread the actual experience of dying more than they do death itself. In the churches, perhaps the dread is fostered by hymns containing lines such as,—

**"When my last hour cometh,
Fraught with strife and pain,"**

**"When my dying hour draws near,
Darkened with sorrow, pain, and fear,"**

and others of similar import. As a matter of fact, the exit

from life in the great majority of cases is very peaceful.¹ The nearest approach to conscious physical or mental distress which the present writer has seen, and he has observed many deaths of Christian and heathen, has been when the dying person has spoken of falling or slipping away, no doubt due to the sensation of physical collapse, and has asked or motioned to be held by the hand. It is safe to say that the harrowing death-bed scenes, which appear to have been quite common formerly, if one may judge by the tracts written for the terror and admonition of the ungodly of the period, are now seldom witnessed, and were due to mental rather than physical causes. One of the greatest of English surgeons, as the result of his wide experience, was inclined to the opinion that death, as a natural act, is accompanied with the sense of ease and satisfaction, which generally accompanies all natural acts, such as is felt in falling asleep when tired out after a hard day's work. This is probably true in the case of those dying naturally of old age. In the course of time we may confidently hope this will be the peaceful ending of nearly all human beings.

Surveying the whole subject of pain that is purely physical, there is ample ground for holding that its ministry has been most beneficial, and that as the race advances in wisdom and kindness, it will at last almost cease to be a problem.

¹ Careful records of about five hundred death-beds, studied particularly with reference to the modes of death and the sensation of dying, show that as to the latter, "ninety suffered bodily pain or distress of one sort or another, eleven showed mental apprehension, two positive terror, one expressed spiritual exaltation, one bitter remorse. The great majority gave no sign one way or the other; like their birth, their death was a sleep and a forgetting" (Osler, *Science and Immortality*, p. 19).

ARTICLE IX.

CRITICAL NOTES.

DO WE WANT A UNIFORM DIVORCE LAW; OR WHAT IS
THE REMEDY?¹

AMERICAN decency was so shocked last summer by the brutal defiance of the law by one whose prominence consisted only of inherited name and money, that the outraged community made haste to find a remedy for a crying evil. In an unconsidered hurry, and with utterly thoughtless haste, all that was said and written suggested but one remedy, and that, a uniform divorce law. In such a race to do something were the outraged, that little or no thought was given to the efficacy and appropriateness of the remedy. Something was needed, and that was needed right off. Even legislators in the state legislatures were run away with; and, voicing the indignation of the whole decent community, it was actually suggested that Senators and members of Congress should be importuned, to the end that an amendment of the Constitution of the United States should be proposed by Congress and sent down to the States for adoption, the terms of which should enable Congress to enact a uniform divorce law. No better illustration could be given of the wisdom of the adage "Make haste slowly," and the unwisdom of undue haste in any matter of such importance and consequence.

Marriage is to be viewed in two aspects. The religious side of the matter and its symbolism is one side; and, on the other hand, the law of the land merely recognizes marriage as a civil contract, indissoluble during life, except by decree of the court, or by the unusual and now practically unknown oper-

¹The author of this paper, being a citizen of New York, writes from the standpoint of one who is anxious to maintain the strict standard of that State, which allows divorce for one cause only, and forbids the remarriage of the guilty party.

ation of a legislative act. Of course all Christian people look upon it in the two aspects; but the community as such only in the one aspect, that of a civil contract, and as such only is the subject to be dealt with by the law of the land. Christian people, so far as the law of the land limits divorce to the ground justified by Scripture, stand with and actively sustain the law. So far as the law goes beyond the scriptural authority, Christian people must occupy the negative position, not by any means approving the law, but by no manner of means disobeying or giving their faith and credence to the law. Any resistance to the law, or to the law on any other subject, would be criminal. So far as marriage is a civil contract and regulated by the statute, we must admit that it is within the province of any State, for its own community and people, to regulate it. That such is the law of the land is to be regretted, but it is, nevertheless, within the realm of state rights.

We apprehend that the evil is not so much in the divorce laws of the different States as in the violation of those laws, by reason of the separate jurisdiction of each State. If it were not for that separate jurisdiction, the offense of last summer could not have been perpetrated, and the decent community would not have been so aroused and incensed. Whatever may be the disabilities for remarriage of divorced persons in the State of their residence or sojourn, or the State in which they are divorced, marriage being a civil contract, a remarriage may take place outside of that State; and contracts, the marriage contract among them, are valid, and must be recognized under the Constitution of the United States as valid, in all the States.

It matters very little, to the finding of the remedy, what are the causes for divorce in the different States, howsoever we regret them. It may not be very generally known that in one of the States there are fourteen causes of divorce; in five States there are eleven causes of divorce; in four States there are ten causes of divorce; in three States and one Territory there are nine causes of divorce; in twelve States there are eight causes of divorce; in six States there are seven causes

of divorce; in ten States there are six causes of divorce; in two States there are five causes of divorce; in two States there are four causes of divorce; and in only one State (New York), and also in the District of Columbia, there is only one cause of divorce.

But the resentment of last summer was not against the state of New York or its laws on the subject of divorce, nor against the man in question because he was divorced, and no doubt justly divorced. The flagrancy of that case was in the fact that, in violation of the law of the State of his residence and in which he was divorced, and in violation of the decree of the court, both of which forbade his remarriage, he went over the line into another State and there remarried, and, in so doing, the Constitution of the United States, regardless of the State in which his remarriage would have been a crime, and would also have made him liable to be proceeded against for contempt of court, was compelled to recognize the validity as a civil contract of his remarriage, because contracted in another jurisdiction.

It is said that a large proportion of the divorces granted in one or more of the Western States are immediately followed by remarriage, and that in many, in most of the cases, the parties seeking divorce are accompanied to their newly acquired Western domicile by the persons with whom they are to remarry, in pursuance of agreements made before the first step toward divorce was taken.

Remarriage it seems, therefore, is a great inducement to divorce; and, if it be so, the remedy is in destroying the inducement rather than changing the laws of divorce.

Let us examine, for a moment, the comparative situation between the East and the West as to causes of divorce. One Eastern State (New York) has but one cause of divorce. In the Western States there are many causes of divorce. In the New England States there are many causes of divorce. It is said that the least number of divorces *per capita* are obtained in the territory of our country along the Atlantic coast from New York to North Carolina inclusive; and that, as to

divorces among native-born citizens, the greatest number *per capita* take place in the New England States and in the northern counties of Ohio, which counties were originally settled by immigration from the New England States. It is an interesting and alarming study, these divorce statistics, and the comparison of localities where they occur and as far as statistics show the nationalities of the people.

Is it at all conceivable that, in case of obtaining a uniform divorce law in all the States, the standard of New York (that is to say, one cause of divorce only) would be the result in a uniform divorce law? Would the different States, with their many causes of divorce, consent, under any circumstances that we can conceive, to submit to have imposed upon them our code of New York in that respect; or would they, if they had the power, impose upon us in such event their laws, with their multitude of causes of divorce? Look for a moment at the figures. Of the forty-eight States in the Union, twenty-seven of them are situated wholly or partly west of Indiana. The Senate of the United States has two senators from each State, and hence, of the ninety-six senators, fifty-four of them are from and represent those twenty-seven States west of Indiana, which is a large working majority of the United States Senate. Therefore the Western States have us in the Senate of the United States. The House of Representatives is apportioned according to population, and the recent census shows that the center of population is at a point in the westerly side of Indiana. Hence, the House of Representatives apportioned on population will have, west of that center in Indiana, one-half of all the members of the House of Representatives, and there are some States east of that center of population which have as objectionable divorce laws as any State west of that center. Should this subject ever come within the power and jurisdiction of Congress, what sort of a uniform divorce law would they give us? Would it be like the divorce law of New York, with only one cause of divorce, or would this powerful majority in both Senate and House of Representatives impose upon us in New York a uniform divorce law, with from six

to fourteen different causes of divorce? It seems as though there were but one answer possible; and that is that the standard of New York would be let down, and that, for all the States, we would have many rather than few causes of divorce. It would seem, therefore, that a uniform divorce law is no remedy for the situation. The risk is too great. The situation it would bring about would be dangerous in the extreme.

What remedy then can be suggested? It would seem to go without saying that each State naturally has pride enough among its citizens to insure that *its own laws* should be enforced, and that every State would be quick to adopt for itself practical uniform legislation, which would destroy the inducement to remarriage of divorced persons within its borders. It would be a happy solution if Congress had the power to legislate, not to the end of making a uniform divorce law, but to the end of making it a federal crime wherever committed, for any divorced person to remarry where forbidden so to do by the statutes of the State in which he was divorced, or by the decree of the court by which he was divorced. But as the Constitution now stands Congress has no such power. What then can be done in that direction? There are in all the States statutes declaring invalid and void marriages between ascendants and descendants, and among some collaterals. A statute in as many States as possible — and each State it would seem would be glad to enact it — which would make illegal and void the remarriage of any divorced person forbidden by the laws of the State in which divorced, or by the decree of divorce against him, to remarry, would operate to make the contract of marriage null and void in every State where such a law would exist. Such a statute would have prevented the outrage of last summer and any other like outrages, and would remove from such immoral remarriages the protection of the United States Constitution; since, if the contract of marriage was thus made illegal, other States would not be required to recognize it.

A further remedy for the like situation could be enacted in the several States, and would free each State from the bane

and bad name of permitting even the celebration of the ceremony of marriage between such divorced persons within its limits. This could be attained by the passage in the different States, each State for itself, of an act making it a crime for any divorced person forbidden by the law of the State in which he obtained his divorce, or by the decree of the court in which he was divorced, from remarrying again anywhere within its limits.

One of the elements that condone such immoral offenses is that portion of society (so-called) which frames its bars and limits to include and welcome the man of money, regardless of his moral character. No matter how repulsive in morals, no matter how indignant the community in general, that part of society receives back into its circle the unclean creature. If in addition to his debased moral character he be stamped with the badge of a criminal, and has "done his time" within prison walls and behind bars for having contracted such an illegal marriage, would that portion of society, so called, receive him within its circle? How would he differ as a criminal from the common thief or other criminal who had been so branded and was a graduate of a prison?

The subject is one that is momentous and of every day increasing alarm, and will continue to be such until some arrangement or remedy is discovered, and it would seem that the remedy is not in hasty action, or in a uniform divorce law, but in deliberate and considerate action, and the condemning and preventing of the remarriage of a divorced person, and creating him a criminal which will exclude him from society and make him a wanderer.

RALPH E. PRIME.

Yonkers, New York.

PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

"Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, that aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing" (1 Pet. iii. 18-20).

A SOLUTION of the difficulties involved in this confessedly perplexing passage calls for a journey, which may at first seem to be far afield. Not a few have thought to find here reason for a hope that to the impenitent dead may be given another opportunity to hear and accept the invitations of divine grace. This passage was a favorite proof-text on the side of what was called the "larger hope", in the "second probation" controversy of twenty years ago, echoes of which can still occasionally be heard. A satisfactory study of the passage should settle the question of the propriety of such inferences. Moreover, there can be no statement given in the word of God which was not intended for the good of man, to impart some valuable and needed truth. The more difficult the passage, the weightier, probably, the truth contained therein, and the better worth our study. An understanding of the passage under discussion can be had only by determining what the "prison" was in which Jesus proclaimed his glad tidings, and who the inhabitants were to whom he spoke, and what their condition.

THE TRUTH ABOUT HADES.

This lies at the bottom of a correct understanding of the passage in question. In such a study it is vitally necessary to recognize our utter lack of knowledge except as we may gain it from the Bible. No amount of theory or speculation can for a single moment unlock the doors of the under-world and let us see its status.

1. In the Old Testament little is said about heaven or hell. They may be inferred, but explicit statements are wanting. The word for "heaven," שָׁמַיִם (*Shamayim*), does not mean the abode of the holy dead, but the skies above the earth. God's

seat of governmental authority was regarded as located there. "The heaven, even the heaven of heavens, is the Lord's"; "It is as high as heaven, what canst thou know?" It was said of Elijah that he "went up by a whirlwind into heaven." That was all Elisha knew or could tell. Elijah went up into the sky. What became of him Elisha did not know, though beyond a doubt he believed that his master was with God. Probably few careful students of the Old Testament will question the statement that "heaven" throughout that book, and very often indeed in the New Testament, refers only to the regions above us. Jacob knew nothing of a place above us where the godly dead dwell, but saw angels coming down from the upper regions and ascending again. As a matter of fact we ourselves would have difficulty in locating heaven. All we can say is that it is outside this earth.

In like manner hell, as the final place of punishment for the ungodly dead, waits for the New Testament to be clearly set forth. It was *death* which awaited godly and ungodly alike in the thought of the Old Testament people, though there was a confident expectation that the lot of the righteous would be better than that of the wicked. So Balaam said, "Let me die the death of the righteous," etc. (see, also, 1 Kings i. 21; ii. 10). The godly were "gathered to their fathers," or "slept with their fathers." It is worth noting that in the New Testament references to the death of Old Testament saints they are not said to have gone to heaven but to have been gathered to their fathers (see Acts xiii. 36, where Paul speaks thus of David. With all the knowledge of heaven possessed by New Testament writers, knowledge based on the plain teaching of Jesus, they did not write of the Old Testament worthies in New Testament terms, as having been taken, at death, to heaven. They recognized the difference between being "gathered to their fathers" and departing "to be with Christ," between going to Hades and going to Heaven.

The grave was the expectation, and it took strong faith to escape being overwhelmed by it. "The dead praise not Jehovah, neither any that go down into silence." "In Sheol

who shall give thee thanks?" "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in Sheol, whither thou goest." Thus the godly believed that they were not to be annihilated, that in some way there would be a good future prepared for them by God (see the words of Job in Job xix. 15-27), but that future was not anything sufficiently definite for them to rejoice in.

2. This was fitting and right. As none can enter heaven but by the atoning work of Jesus, and that work had not yet been wrought out on the cross, it was not proper that the godly dead should enter heaven till it had been accomplished. John the Baptist said, "He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life." John the Apostle wrote, "To as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become the sons of God." Jesus said, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life." There cannot be two roads to heaven, two ways of gaining eternal life. The biblical teaching makes it plain that only through Christ's atoning work, and only by a conscious acceptance of that work for himself, can any soul gain eternal life and a place in heaven. If any should bring up the case of those dying in infancy, we must lay it down as a rule of biblical interpretation that no difficulty suggested by us, in our imperfect view of the subject, can stand against the plain teaching of the Word of God. God knew of those difficulties, if they really are such, when he gave the inspired word; and we can safely leave the solution to him. We may, however, assume that the innocent babes, in whose salvation we have sufficient warrant for believing, will have Christ's redemptive work presented to them, and that, whatever may be its relation to those who have not the guilt of personal sin on their souls, they will gladly accept it.

3. Paradise. There is abundant reason, from the Scriptures, for believing that in Sheol, or Hades, the godly dead were happy, and Jesus taught this clearly in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Without making the parable "go on all fours," we cannot help seeing that, before the atoning work was completed, the godly, not yet in heaven, were in

blessedness, and the ungodly, not yet in hell, were already in torment. This is reasonable. If the godly were in such an attitude that on the presentation of Christ's work they would instantly and gladly accept it, to keep them in misery would be unjust, if there was ever to be an atonement made for them. If the ungodly had so hardened their hearts against God that to present Jesus to them would be of no avail, self-judged, as Paul says in Romans ii., their treatment would be unjust if they were given happiness. As a matter of fact, unless, pending the atonement for the one and the final judgment for the other, they were to be held in an unconscious state, the stings of conscience would make torment for the one, and an approving conscience happiness for the other.

Paradise, therefore, before Christ rose from the dead, was that division of Hades, the under-world, the place of the dead, where the godly dead were waiting. Jesus said to the thief on the cross, "Verily, I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." That was not heaven, for after his resurrection he said to Mary, "I am not yet ascended to the Father."

After his ascension, Paradise was no longer in Hades. See 2 Cor. xii. 2-4, where Paul says in verse 2 that he was caught up to the third heaven, and in verse 4 that he was caught up into Paradise. See also Rev. ii. 7, where the tree of life is located in Paradise, and Rev. xxii. 2, where it is located in the New Jerusalem, thus identifying the New Jerusalem and Paradise.

Just where Hades was and is located, just where all the dead once were and the ungodly dead are now, is interesting, but has no special importance in this discussion. We are concerned not with the exact location of Hades, but with the relation to it which the godly and ungodly have sustained.

THE PREACHING TO THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.

Now what has all this to do with the explanation of the passages which we set out to study? Let us review.

First, we have seen that godly and ungodly were in the

under-world, conscious, the one happy and the other tormented; secondly, we have seen that the godly could not ascend to heaven till Christ's atoning work had been completed; thirdly, Paradise was then in Hades, the apartment, we may say, of the godly dead. Thither Jesus and the penitent thief went from their different crosses.

These godly dead were sinners, all of them, unfit for heaven, till cleansed by the blood of the atonement. Many had had distant glimpses of the coming of the Saviour, and had believed, but had not full knowledge (see 1 Pet. i. 10-11). They were in prison; for, the atonement not having been completed, they could not properly be declared justified by being taken to God's immediate presence, though practically they were under God's smile in Paradise. To these Jesus went, declared the completion of his redemptive work, and gave each the opportunity to personally accept it, which each one would eagerly, gladly do, for only those of that attitude of heart would be in that part of Hades. At the resurrection of Jesus he took these with him to heaven. Just when he did that, whether at the end of the forty days, when he ascended in the presence of the disciples, or whether he led them to his Father's presence earlier, we cannot say. For him to go into heaven was not such a transition as it is for us. Note his words to Nicodemus, "the Son of man who is in heaven" (John iii. 13). A glimpse of that coming forth from Hades is given in Matt. xxvii. 52-53: "And the tombs were opened; and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many." It is as though such a great event could not take place without its being proper that men should see something of it. Therefore, some of the dead were permitted to receive their bodies for a time, that men might see them. Of course they did not receive their resurrection bodies. Those will be given at the return of Christ (see 1 Thess. iv. 13-17).

But, what about that particular statement, "That aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in

the days of Noah," etc.? This should be taken with the statement made in chapter iv. 6, "For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit." Let us examine the latter of these first. This statement exactly expresses the situation which we have discovered in our previous study. The godly dead had sinned, and had incurred the penalty, bodily death (Rom. v. 12), though they were to escape the penalty of eternal death. Besides, as we have seen, they were still kept out of heaven till the atoning sacrifice for their sins should have been offered by the Son of God. Therefore, as men, they had been judged, found guilty, and condemned to suffer the penalty of physical death, which had been pronounced on the *race* as such. The judgment of eternal death, however, was not pronounced on them, but by the grace of God they became inheritors of eternal, spiritual life, though it could not be formally conferred on them till Jesus died and rose again. It was necessary, however, that they should consciously accept the atoning work of Christ. "*To as many as received him*" (John i. 12). For that purpose it was necessary that the atonement should be presented to them. This Jesus did. It would be quite correct to read the passage in question as follows, "For unto this end was the gospel preached, even to the dead, that *though* they had been judged indeed according to men in the flesh, they might live according to God in the Spirit." Note a similar change by the Revisers in Rom. vi. 17. Our Lord must have had great joy, after his rejection by the living, to thus present his work to this multitude of past ages, and see their rapture and ecstasy as they grasped that hope which they had believed on and waited for in their days of trial on earth.

There is no occasion for discussing the possibility of his having presented the gospel to the ungodly dead. Since, as we have seen, both godly and ungodly were in Sheol, or Hades, but separated from each other, Jesus certainly did not go to the ungodly. They were not in Paradise. Jesus did not tell

the penitent thief that he should be with him among the ungodly dead. They did not and will not "live according to God in the spirit," though, in common with the godly and ungodly of all ages, they were and had been "judged according to men in the flesh."

Now to continue the examination of chapter iii. 20. The reason for introducing Noah seems to be only to open the way for calling attention to the old-time long-suffering of God, and to the ark as a figure of our salvation. The days before Jesus came were indeed days of the long-suffering of God. He withheld punishment, long due, till the Redeemer should come, and the redemption be prepared. In similar manner he withheld punishment on the ungodly antediluvian world till the ark should be ready. The saving of Noah is used as an illustration of God's patience through the millenniums before Christ; and the people who were disobedient in the days of Noah, but yet did repent, stand for all such before Christ.

The Greek *pote* may be translated "formerly" as well as "sometime" (R. V.) or "then" (A. V.), and we might very properly insert "as," and read, "who were formerly disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited (as) in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." This instance of the saving of Noah may have been chosen because, at that time, there was such a sharp distinction and contrast between the godly and ungodly. When Elijah thought himself alone God said to him: "Yet will I leave me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed to Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him" (1 Kings xix. 18). But to Noah he said, "For thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation" (Gen. vii. 1), the evident implication being "Thee *only* have I seen."

This explanation falls in and harmonizes with what we have previously learned about the condition of the godly dead before Calvary and our Lord's resurrection. The godly were disobedient in Noah's time. Noah himself was disobedient. His drunkenness after the flood was doubtless not his first offense. Yet he and they were godly in that time when the long-suffer-

ing of God waited. They were godly, but there had been no provision made for the pardon of their sins. They were so godly as to be saved while the rest of the world was destroyed. Yet before they could be taken to the immediate presence of God they must be justified by a voluntary acceptance of the atoning work of Christ, the Lamb of God, slain 33 A. D., but "from the foundation of the world" in the plan of God.

The spirits to whom Jesus preached were those of the godly dead, who had died before he had accomplished his atoning work. This number would include the long list of Hebrew worthies who had been obedient to God during the preceding centuries, those in other nations who, following the inner light of conscience, or catching some faint gleams of the light that shone on Israel, sought for true character and the true God. It would include Abel and our first parents, and all godly antediluvian dead. There was doubtless a great host. They were "in prison," yet not in suffering, not permitted to remain on earth nor yet admitted to heaven, but conscious of an approving conscience and the smile of God, and expectant of a happy future, while ignorant, doubtless, as to just what that future might contain. They were in the position of repentant law-breakers for whom an arrangement is going to be made by which they may be pardoned and released, but who are kept in prison till such arrangements can be completed. They would be treated with a consideration not accorded to other prisoners, while not yet permitted to go free.

The basis of the explanation of this passage must be:—

1. The words must have a meaning. The character of the entire letter, evidently inspired, precludes such an idea as that this can be a rambling, meaningless statement.

2. We have no reason to believe that the long-suffering of God was more greatly tried in the time of Noah than later, when he had made a fuller manifestation of himself, and man had less excuse for sin.

3. The case of Noah must therefore have been chosen (1) as peculiarly illustrative of God's patience with man through all the ages, giving a period the classes of which were espec-

fully fitted to illustrate the preaching to the spirits in prison, which is really but a digression from the apostle's main line of argument, and (2) as leading up to baptism and the lesson to be drawn from it in verse 21. It has been said that the classes in this period, the days of Noah, were especially fitted to illustrate the preaching to the spirits in prison. Probably never since that period, and never before, after the human race became at all numerous, has there been a time when the good and the bad among mankind were so evidently and sharply separated before the eyes of men. "And the earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence" (Gen. vi. 11). This was the one instance in the entire course of the world's history when divine wisdom found it necessary to depopulate the earth and to start the race practically anew. Those who had so corrupted themselves as to be unfit to live on the earth were certainly not proper candidates for a preaching of the gospel to them in Hades. The souls who faced truth and duty in that time and accepted or rejected could with peculiar safety be used by the apostles to illustrate the mission of Christ to the spirits in prison. The writer guarded as carefully as possible his teaching from being perverted into support of any "second probation" idea.

NOTE.

It is a legitimate inference from this study, that, if the godly dead, before the resurrection of the Lord, were in prison, in Sheol, and were released only by his loving work of grace, the ungodly dead, who were also in Sheol, and had certainly no such deliverance at the hand of Christ, are there still. This puts the stamp of falsity on spiritism, in so far as it claims to give communication with the spirits of the dead. The godly dead would certainly not respond to human attempts at communication, for God, their God, has forbidden such attempts. The ungodly dead cannot respond, for they are still in prison. The truth in spiritism, so far as there is any, and the writer of this believes there is much, is simply that evil spirits are permitted to be abroad, among us, and they, for their own

evil purposes, seek to impersonate the dead. For this belief there is the best of biblical warrant. Spiritism is absolutely false, so far as it claims to give communication with the dead. Spiritism probably has a certain awful reality, but it is the reality of demonology and demon worship, than which there is nothing more debasing and utterly ruinous.

A. EUGENE THOMSON.

Simpsonville, Kentucky.

DR. DRIVER ON EXODUS.¹

DR. DRIVER's long-expected volume on Exodus has at last appeared. A reviewer cannot welcome it with satisfaction, for to treat the volume conscientiously is an exceptionally odious as well as an exceptionally difficult task. The present writer, at any rate, in the course of a singularly unfortunate experience, has never found a reviewer's labors so distasteful or performed them with so much reluctance as in the present instance.

On Dr. Driver's own showing, the book has taken a long time to write. We are told in the Preface that the greater part of the notes were in type when the commentary of Mr. Mac Neile appeared, i.e. in May, 1908; and, though the Preface itself is dated 5 February, 1911, a perusal of the volume shows that the bulk of it is old, and written without any reference to much of the recent work on the subject. For instance, there is not a single reference to the German books of Eerdmans. There are occasional references to some of his English articles, and to work of other writers that has appeared more recently than the first instalments of the "*Alttestamentliche Studien*." Not that Dr. Driver minds referring to German books — far from it. That is not the reason for

¹ *The Book of Exodus in the Revised Version, with Introduction and Notes.* By the Rev. S. R. Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Hon. D.Litt. Cambridge and Dublin, Hon. D.D. Glasgow and Aberdeen; Fellow of the British Academy; Corresponding Member of the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1911.

his reticence. And there is no direct reference to my work. Two passages in the notes may have been influenced by me (though I may be wrong in this inference), and with these I will deal later on. But there is a sentence in the Preface which can be interpreted only as a claim that he was entirely acquainted with the facts and arguments I had advanced. After stating that, in his opinion, his "conclusions . . . rest in their broader outlines upon secure foundations," he continues: "I say this with full knowledge of what has been said by various writers on the other side. Assiduous and painstaking as the labours of some of these writers have been, it does not appear to me that they have been successful either in shaking the great cumulative argument which shows that the traditional position is untenable, or in finding a better explanation of the facts presented by the Old Testament itself than, substantially, — I expressly do not say, in every particular, — that which is commonly associated with the name of Wellhausen." Observe there is a claim to "*full knowledge of what has been said by various writers on the other side.*" It is dated 5 February, 1911. Writing to me exactly three weeks previously, Dr. Driver had made the very much more moderate statement that he was "acquainted with my writings and had read considerable parts of them." "Considerable parts" is not a synonym for full knowledge or even an adequate basis for full knowledge: yet, of course, it might be possible to argue that Dr. Driver had spent the whole or some part of the three weeks in obtaining the full knowledge he here claims. Unfortunately the contents of the book show that neither he nor his general editor had that full knowledge or anything like it. I regret to say that they are of such a character as to throw a most unfavorable light alike on this statement, and on his conduct as a general editor of the International Critical Commentary.

In writing on these subjects, I have repeatedly drawn attention to the fact that the ordinary statement of the Wellhausen school that in early times all slaughter was sacrificial cannot be sustained. On pages 175 ff. of "Essays on Penta-

teuchal Criticism" I was careful to make this point at full length, particularly explaining that Dr. Driver contradicted himself on the subject in his commentary on Deuteronomy, following the ordinary Wellhausen allegations in one place and contradicting them in a note on the same page. Now I drew attention to this point again in the article on Dr. Skinner in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for October, 1910¹ (which Dr. Driver claims to have read carefully), and again in the *Expositor* for November, 1910, in an article to which I referred in the correspondence.² If, therefore, Dr. Driver really has "full knowledge" of any conservative point, this must be it. Will it be believed that in this commentary on Exodus he again stultifies himself by a similar self-contradiction on this very question? On page 223 the phrase of Exodus xxi. 37 (E. V. xxii. 1), "and kill it," comes up for consideration. Dr. Driver writes: "The word is the one regularly used of slaughtering cattle for food (Gen. xliii. 16; 1 Sam. xxv. 11 *al.*)." These passages and others make it quite clear that non-sacrificial slaughter for food was common. Yet, at the top of page 207, in commenting on another Hebrew word, he writes, *without any reference to the evidence of Exodus xxi. 37 and the other passages*, "Since in early times animals were seldom, if ever, killed without an accompanying sacrifice." Other instances to which I have drawn attention are not cited. Now I have to ask, Is it possible that a man who has enough intelligence to produce a commentary on Exodus should continue repeating the statement and contradicting himself on the point if he in fact had the full knowledge he claims? To me it appears that this question can be answered only in one way.

Another point that is of very great importance is the matter of altars. On page 291, "the horns of it" (Ex. xxvii. 2) suggest to Dr. Driver such remarks as the following: "these were an indispensable part of an altar (cf. xxx. 2, 3), and were regarded as its most sacred part . . . a criminal seeking asylum seized hold of them (1 Kings i. 50; ii. 28)." Now I have explained (*op. cit.*, p. 181) that an altar of earth or

¹ Page 687.² Page 415.

unhewn stones could have no horns since the nature of the materials would not allow them. A "full knowledge" of my writings would, therefore, have shown Dr. Driver that his statement that the horns were an indispensable part of an altar "was incapable of being supported.

A third example may be taken from his conduct in respect of Dr. Kent's book "Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents." One of the most eminent living authorities on ancient law wrote to me that Dr. Kent's book was "in fact very disgraceful." If Dr. Driver likes to submit my review of that book (a copy of which was sent to him in 1908) to any Oxford law don in whom he has confidence, he can obtain independent confirmation of this view. Yet he actually recommends the volume on page 2 of the eighth edition of his "Literature of the Old Testament," and follows up this recommendation by referring his unfortunate readers to it in his "Exodus" (pp. lxiii. *note*, 418 *note*).

There is no object in multiplying instances. Dr. Driver's "knowledge" is obviously not "full." "Studies in Biblical Law," "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," and the article on "Priests and Levites" in the July, 1910, number of the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* together answer most of his points. In some cases it might be open to Dr. Driver to reply that, to his mind, the answers were not convincing; but that cannot well be the case with the instances I have considered.

Nor again could this be said of the uncertainty of the Masoretic text as to the Divine appellations, a matter of which Dr. Driver says no word in spite of his formal reservation in the correspondence with me of the right to treat the matter in whatever manner he might think proper. That question has now reached a stage in which it can no longer be pretended that complete silence is compatible with honorable candor towards his public.

It appears to me, therefore, that his conduct raises questions of great and fundamental gravity touching the responsibilities of a writer to his readers, especially when those readers may in many cases be school-boys or other junior

students who stand in peculiar need of protection. Dr. Driver has raised questions of conscience that are of greater moment than any questions of scholarship. How far is any writer justified in solemnly holding himself out as possessing knowledge that he does not in fact possess? How far is he justified in asking his readers to believe him or accept his conclusions on the strength of this profession of knowledge? How far is he justified in recommending or referring his readers to very disgraceful books without a word of warning? How far is it right that these things should be done under the shelter of the name of a great University? Are such actions creditable or even excusable features of a "Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges," or indeed of any Bible commentary? Is this what the public expects of professors and others who undertake to give instruction on the Bible to more or less defenseless students? These are questions to be answered not merely by Dr. Driver and his general editor, but also by those who are responsible for the reputation of the Cambridge University Press, by all who are engaged in teaching or learning the Bible, and by the general public.

It remains for me to say a few words on the passages that appear to have been influenced by my work. In Exodus vi. 3, Dr. Driver adopts הוֹדַעְתִּי for נִדַּחְתִּי, and in xviii. 6 הִנֵּה for אֲנִי; but in both instances it seems probable that this is the result of an independent yielding to the overwhelming evidence, and not to anything I have written. There are, however, two other passages where I suspect something more. The first of these is in the note on Exodus xxi. 6. On the words "the door," Dr. Driver writes: "not as has been supposed, of the sanctuary." The "supposition" to which he alludes in these distant terms is enshrined in his own commentary on Deuteronomy. Why does he now contradict it without assigning any reason?¹ Has he really discovered that a

¹ On his present approval of the conjecture that *elohim* in this passage should be rendered 'gods,' and understood of the household gods and of Kautzsch's view that the reference is to an image of God, I need only refer him to my Notes on Hebrew Religion, pp. 24 f.

mound or stone will not develop a door or doorpost even if it be called a sanctuary?

The other passage is Exodus xxxiii. 7, "the tent." On this he writes (p. 359): "the rendering '*a* tent' which Hebrew idiom would also permit, does not suit the sequel, which implies that not a casual, but a *definite* tent, is meant." No name is mentioned, but it seems not unlikely that this note is due to my insistence on the rendering '*a* tent' as being here the correct equivalent of the Hebrew. It is therefore right that I should deal with the argument. It is unnecessary on the point of definiteness to do more than to quote Dr. Driver's note on page 160 ("in *a* book," Ex. xvii. 14). After citing Dillmann's words, "the Hebrew always writes '*in the book*,'" Dr. Driver continues in his own language thus: "an object being conceived as definite in Hebrew not only because it is already known or has been mentioned before, but also because it is taken for a particular purpose, and so made definite in the speaker's or writer's mind. See numerous examples in Gesenius-Kautzsch, sect. 126 r. s.; e. g. Ex. xvi. 32 *the* omerful, xxi. 20 with *the* rod, Num. xxi. 9 put it on *the* pole, Jos. ii. 15 with *the* cord, etc.; in all such cases we naturally say *a*." Precisely: *a* casual tent taken for a particular purpose and so made definite in the writer's mind would be expressed by *the* in Hebrew, *a* in English, and that is exactly what the sequel requires, for Dr. Driver's own next note on the subject enforces this truth. He writes: "*pitch it*] Heb. *pitch it for himself*: it was intended particularly for his own use, in his converse with God." Exactly; and, that being so, it cannot (as Dr. Driver believes) have been the abode of the Ark. It is incredible that Moses should have been in the habit of taking the shelter of the Ark, and pitching it particularly for his own use while leaving the Ark in the camp in a denuded and unprotected condition. For the rest, Dr. Driver has entirely failed to meet the points which, as I have shown elsewhere,¹ make his view impossible.

¹ *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 90-102; cp. *The Origin of the Pentateuch*, pp. 53 ff.

There are many other points that are open to criticism; and, in ordinary circumstances, I should have dealt with some of these. But, having regard to the peculiar nature of this publication, I do not think it right to do anything that might have the effect of distracting attention from the larger issues involved. We have to deal with a course of conduct that affects the good name and honor of two Universities, and the interests of youthful students who are not yet able to protect themselves.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

London, England.

FROM DR. DRIVER.

CH. CH., OXFORD,

Dec. 7.

Dear Sir:—

I am much obliged to you for sending me a proof of your note on Exodus. I do not propose to write any reply to it: I will merely, as I am writing to you now, point out an error of fact, into which I think you have fallen, with regard to what I say respecting Ex. 21. 6. In my Commentary on Dt., p. 184, I cannot see that I explain the 'door' in Ex. as that of the sanctuary: I say that I think the clause containing the word is ambiguous; but I am not aware that I express any preference for the view that the door is that of the sanctuary. Nor can I see that in my note on Ex. 21. 6 I "approve" the opinion either that *elohim* mean 'gods', or that it denotes an image of Yahweh; I mention these views, as held by certain scholars; but I say nothing (such as 'This is better', or 'more probable') to suggest that I adopt either of them myself.

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

S. R. DRIVER.

TO DR. DRIVER.

9 OLD SQUARE,
LINCOLN'S INN, W. C.

Dear Sir:—

Thank you for your letter. I note what you say with regard to the explanation of Ex. xxi. 6 in your Deuteronomy: but I was very careful in my choice of language. The word I selected — 'enshrined' — was intended to cover, and does, I think, in fact cover exactly that interpretation of the Deuteronomy note which you now tell me is the right one. It is the case that when you wrote your Deuteronomy you regarded as possible a view of Ex. xxi. which you now regard as impossible for some reason or reasons which you do not state: and my expressions appear to me to meet precisely this condition of affairs.

As to the other question there is, I think, a *bona fide* difference of opinion between us as to the effect of your note. If I am not mistaken this arises from a difference of attitude. When I read it I reason thus: 'What would any junior student understand by this? One view is mentioned only to be rejected: certain other views are cited without any suggestion that there is any objection to them or any warning as to adopting them: and other interpretations are not even mentioned. A commentator who puts forward certain views without objective question, warning, expression of doubt, or alternative, must be held to recommend those views. Surely he cannot be supposed to put them forward because he does *not* adopt them. Surely, too, no schoolboy would suspect that the commentator regarded them as incorrect. If the commentator does not believe the interpretations he himself adduces without doubt or question, what on earth does he believe or mean his readers to believe?' I cannot see that there is any possible answer to this *from the standpoint of the public for whom the book was written.*

Believe me,

Yours sincerely,

8 December, 1911.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

PALESTINE AND ITS TRANSFORMATION. By ELLSWORTH HUNTINGTON, Assistant Professor of Geography in Yale University. With illustrations. 8vo. Pp. xvii, 443. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1911.

The author of this volume is both a geologist and a geographer, and has made more extensive investigations than any one else upon the climatic changes which have taken place in central and western Asia during the recent geological period. As a result of his study, he published a most important volume, entitled "The Pulse of Asia," in which he formulated the theory that, while there has been, in general, a gradual desiccation of central and western Asia since the glacial period, this has not been a strictly uniform process, but has proceeded in a series of cycles during which wet and dry periods have followed each other at irregular intervals. In 1909 Professor Huntington was permitted to visit Palestine, and spend the greater part of the year in study of the evidence there supporting his theory. This with his previous experience has enabled him to make the present volume one of the most instructive and important ever written upon the physical characteristics of Palestine.

In the light of his presentation, one easily sees how the elevation of the plateau of Judea secured for the tribe of Judah that isolation which was necessary to protect them from absorption by surrounding heathen nations. The defection of the Northern tribes is seen to be a natural result of the highway through Samaria, made possible by the lower elevation of the region, secured in the great geological movements that produced the remarkable fissure in the earth's crust occupied by the Jordan River and the Dead Sea. No clearer and more vivid conception of the Land and the Book has ever been

made than in the first few chapters of this volume. Coming to the question of the climatic changes which have occurred in Palestine, Professor Huntington thinks the evidence is conclusive that the rainfall is now much less than it was during the fifteen hundred years previous to 708 A.D., and that previous to 1200 B.C. the rainfall was much greater than it has since been. The evidence upon which the author relies is drawn largely from the present incapacity of vast regions in western Asia to support the population which was attributed to them in earlier times. Palmyra, for example, which flourished during the first three centuries of the Christian era, and was on a much-used caravan route between Babylonia and Syria, is now almost completely deserted both by the residents and by the caravans. Other routes across the desert, notably the one from Petra to the east, which were formerly traversed by large and frequent caravans and military expeditions, are now entirely abandoned. It would seem incredible, also, that Palestine could now be made to support the population which it did in the time of David, unless there were an increase of rainfall during the spring months, when grain is dependent upon what, in Scripture, are called the "latter rains." Evidence of a diminished rainfall in southern Palestine and east of the Jordan is adduced from the present barrenness of those regions, and east of the Jordan by the remains of Roman bridges spanning what are now dry water-courses.

It would be a valuable addition to apologetics if Professor Huntington's theory could be established; for, in that case, the wanderings of the children of Israel during forty years in the wilderness, and the large population attributed to Palestine soon after the Conquest, would appear more credible. But several considerations make the theory of an increased rainfall during the early historic period unnecessary and improbable.

1. As Mr. Huntington surmises, and as our contributor Mr. Wiener has pretty clearly proven,¹ the numerical estimate of the Israelites who entered Palestine under Joshua is greatly

¹ See *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*, pp. 155-169.

exaggerated in the Massoretic text of our Hebrew Bibles. Probably those numbers should be divided by ten, which would reduce them to reasonable estimates, even under the conditions which we know to have existed at that time.

2. Mr. Huntington, as we believe, fails to appreciate the destructive influence of erosion following the removal of the forests, and the neglect of the terraces which originally were made to keep the soil in place upon the side hills. The hills that formerly were covered with fertile soil are now, to a large extent, washed bare of soil and are incapable of being restored to their former fertility.

3. As Mr. Huntington admits, only a slight amount of increase of rainfall in the spring months, when the grain was ripening, would be necessary greatly to increase the harvests. But innumerable abandoned reservoirs, both open and subterranean, would seem to have provided what was necessary to supply the deficiency of moisture needed, in former times, at that period of the year. Professor Libbey, among others, reports a large number of these in the plateau overlooking the banks of each of the great canyons leading down from the eastern plateau to the Dead Sea. Some of these are still used, but many doubtless are so guarded by the natives that they have escaped the notice of foreigners. Petra itself must have depended upon such reservoirs for its supply of water in the time of its prosperity. At Medeba, the most southerly of the great open reservoirs was destroyed by the Turks to stop disputes among the Arabs. Where the subterranean caverns hewn out of the solid rock in the country east of the Jordan are found empty, it is generally due to the fracturing of the limestone in which they have been hewn.

4. Mr. Huntington fails, as we believe, to make due allowance for the desolating influences of a nomad population when unrestrained by a well-organized government. It is a significant adage that the "nomad brings the desert with him." The truth of this adage is illustrated in many recurring periods of history. In Judges vi. 5 we read that the Midianites, the Amalekites, and the children of the east came as far as Gaza

with their cattle and their tents, and they were "as locusts for multitude," and "they came into the land to destroy it." Similar incursions are continually made into the settled regions east of the Jordan at the present time. Indeed, Professor Huntington gives a vivid account of such an incursion witnessed in the Hauran in 1909, when an Arab tribe with "thousands and thousands of camels, passed" over the country as far as Gilead and Galilee, eating every green thing and drinking the pools dry. From such incursions the settled inhabitants have now no protection, so that all inducements to the improvement of regular agriculture are taken away.

Professor Huntington's theory, as already remarked, does not involve a gradual diminution of rainfall, but is complicated by the supposition of recurring periods of greater and less precipitation, the periods of precipitation diminishing gradually. In support of this theory he appeals to history, which indicates various recurring periods of prosperity and depression over western Asia and the Mediterranean basin. But a careful reading of the history shows that these periods can be accounted for pretty generally by the political and social changes which took place in connection with the disintegration of the Roman Empire and the vicissitudes connected with the rise and spread of Mohammedanism.

5. Finally, a more conclusive objection to Mr. Huntington's theory is to be found in the comparative stability of the level of the Dead Sea since the time of Joshua. The Dead Sea being an inclosed basin, in which there is an equilibrium established between the rainfall and the evaporation in the valley, it follows that any perceptible increase in the rainfall would result in a marked rise in the Dead Sea. But there is no reliable evidence that such a rise has occurred in that body of water since historic times, except as it has been produced by a diminution of the evaporating surface of the Sea caused by the encroachment of the deltas brought in by the tributary streams.¹ The shore-lines at various levels above that of the

¹ See paper by G. F. Wright, "Geological Light on the Interpretation of 'The Tongue' in Joshua xv. 2, 5; xviii. 19," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxx. (1911) pp. 18-28.

present surface of the Dead Sea are probably connected with the climatic conditions marking the closing stages of the glacial period, which preceded the historical period by some thousands of years.

WIDER DEN BANN DER QUELLENSCHIEDUNG. Anleitung zu einer neuen Erfassung des Pentateuch-Problems. Von Lic. theol. WILHELM MÖLLER, Pastor in Apollensdorf b. Klein-Wittenberg, Bez. Halle. In Kommissionsverlag bei C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh. 1912.

Pastor Möller is already well known in Europe and America for the courage, the industry, the ability, and the learning with which in former works he has combated unsound theories that had attained to extraordinary predominance in Germany. In English-speaking countries the articles in Murray's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* and the volume which appeared in English dress under the title "Are the Critics Right?" are the most familiar of his writings. The latter in particular has exercised considerable influence, and is still studied by all who desire to see what can be said for a more conservative view than that advocated by the school of Wellhausen, against whose hypotheses it was directed. It has now found an important sequel in the volume under notice in which the author returns to the Pentateuch.

Perhaps the most notable feature of the book is the broad fact that Möller has been driven by his studies to break definitely and decisively with the documentary theory. This represents a distinct advance on his part in the conservative direction. Originally he was a supporter of the Graf-Wellhausen school, but he was constrained by facts to abandon the evolutionary hypothesis, without, however, repudiating the documentary theory. Now he has taken the further step and disavowed himself from the documentary theory as well. That is the only position that is possible in the long run. Such compromises as those attempted by Robertson in his valuable book on the "Early Religion of Israel" or Orr in his fascinating "Problem of the Old Testament" cannot be maintained in the

face of the arguments that these very writers and others have advanced; and Möller is therefore to be admired for his intrepid action in daring to denounce the theory in a country that is dominated by so hidebound a theology as that of Germany to-day. In reading his book it was forced upon me that German theology is not abreast of the times, and strangely enough, I found that Möller himself has begun to suspect something of the kind. On page 206 he says, in reference to some conservative books, that if they continue to be neglected other countries will thrust German theology from the leading position that it has hitherto occupied. The only criticism I have to make on this is that the event here foretold has already begun to take place. There is no German theologian whose work is comparable to that of Van Hoonacker: and the revolt against Astruc is led by writers who, even when they publish in the German language, are not of German birth. Eerdmans in Holland and Schlögl in Austria are familiar instances of this phenomenon. There are no books written in the German language that can be compared with Orr's "Problem of the Old Testament" or J. S. Griffiths's "Problem of Deuteronomy," and it would be difficult to find a German pamphlet possessing the merits of W. St. Clair Tisdall's "Why I am Not a Higher Critic." The belief in the preëminence of Germany in Old Testament studies is an outworn superstition.

As a whole, Möller's book contains too much matter to lend itself easily to a summary. Those who are working at the subject must use it for themselves and compare it with other authorities. But something should be said as to what parts of the book are likely to prove of most service to English readers. Here the choice does not seem to be difficult. Certain parts are largely concerned with the work of Sievers, who has exercised but slight influence in the English-speaking world, and to these, therefore, a secondary place may be accorded. There is, also, a very long consideration of the story of Abraham, which is probably too detailed to prove attractive to all tastes. On the other hand, there is a most excellent discussion of the use of doublets as a means of establishing the docu-

mentary theory, and this should be widely studied. What an admirable thing it would be if anybody could induce some of our poor higher critical theorists really to master and grapple with this part of Möller's work! There are many suggestive remarks and valuable discussions scattered about the book (see, e.g., pp. 84 f., 174-181, and especially 194-221).

I would venture to express a hope that the portions most suitable to English readers might be translated and published in pamphlet form — if necessary with supplementary matter. This would be better than either to leave the book wholly untranslated, or to publish a complete translation of a volume that in large sections is peculiarly adapted to German taste.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

CONCERNING THE DATE OF THE BOHAIRIC VERSION, covering a Detailed Examination of the Text of the Apocalypse, and a Review of Some of the Writings of the Egyptian Monks. By H. C. HOSKIER. 8vo. Pp. vii, 203. London: Bernard Quaritch. 1911. 7s. 6d., *net*.

It is becoming more and more evident that Westcott and Hort undervalued the evidence of the Versions in determining the original text of the New Testament. This is made clear in Mr. Hoskier's two volumes "Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament" (noticed in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for October, 1911). The present volume, in elaborate detail, shows that the Bohairic Version, circulated in northern Egypt, antedated the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., which were regarded as such supreme authority by Westcott and Hort. The evidence set forth is largely derived from the Apocalypse, to which the author has given special attention. But the conclusions will apply in equal measure to the Gospels and the Epistles. From the evidence presented it appears "that both the old Syriac and the old Latin versions were familiar to the scribes" that copied the Sinaitic, Alexandrian, and Vatican MSS., and "were *both* part and parcel of the groundwork of their original Greek text." The Sinaitic MS., indeed, is "so strongly" Syriac that "it is impossible for the

text to be such as it is without the influence of a double syriac-greek version lying before the scribe or before his forerunner." Likewise, "the *groundwork* of whatever is good in A comes from an old syriac-greek copy *before* it reached Egypt." Further proof of these conclusions is promised from the Freer MS., soon to be published by Professor Sanders (pp. 110, 111). It need not be said that these conclusions are highly important, and that the data upon which they are based deserve careful consideration in all efforts to determine the original text of the New Testament.

THE DATE OF THE COMPOSITION OF DEUTERONOMY: A Critical Study. By HUGH POPE, O.P., S.T.L., Doctor of Sacred Scripture, Member of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Collegio Angelico, Rome. 8vo. Pp. xix, 198. Rome, New York, Ratisbon, Cincinnati: Frederick Pustet.

The tide is turning. The defenders of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch are coming rapidly to the front; while the Wellhausen critics are as rapidly retiring to the rank of out-of-date authors, and their work is being shown to be a remarkable illustration of misdirected scholarship. In our July number (1911), attention was directed to an able defense of the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy by Rev. G. S. Griffiths, a scholarly and brilliant curate of the English Church, an author who, like so many others, had first been captivated by the display of learning made by the Wellhausen critics, but whose views suffered a complete revulsion in the process of verifying their references. The present work is from a young Roman Catholic professor, and amply sustains the reputation for scholarship possessed by the great mass of Catholic commentators and critics, of whom Van Hoonacker is prominent. Dr. Pope has carefully read and considered the entire list of the modern critics who dispute the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy, and has answered their arguments in a manner that must be satisfactory to any candid reader. The false assumptions and the misstatements of facts continually made by these

critics are such as to cause one to blush for the credulity of their followers in accepting their statements without verification. For example, "Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, p. 124, talks of 'the Deuteronomic lawgiver' as 'giving to the extraneous Levites an equal right of *sacrificing* in Jerusalem'" (p. 13). But he is able to do this only by transforming the word "minister" into "sacrifice." Carpenter and Battersby (*The Hexateuch*, vol. i. p. 80) say: "In the Shiloh temple, Samuel, himself *no Levite*, still less a priest"; whereas, 1 Chron. vi. 33-35, Samuel, the son of Elkanah, is reckoned among the sons of the Kohathites, and the genealogical tree is the same as that given in 1 Sam. i. 1. In the same work (pp. 79, 80) we are told that "prior to the Jerusalem temple there is no trace of any exclusively authorised sanctuary. The Mosaic tent is fixed at Shiloh (Jos. xviii. 1), but there is even in Joshua's time a holy place at Shechem." Their only evidence of this is Josh. xxiv. 1, where there is nothing said about a sanctuary, and where the Greek text adopted by Gratz reads "Shiloh" instead of "Shechem."

In due order Dr. Pope takes up the questions of post-Mosaic material in the Pentateuch, of the central sanctuary at Shiloh, of the Levitical priesthood, of the discovery of the book of the Law, and the style of Deuteronomy, of its literary affinities, its witness to itself, and the witness of archæology, leading to the conclusion which will be accepted by all Catholic scholars, that the book "must be referred to the Mosaic age, but it does not follow that Moses actually wrote it himself . . . for it seems to bear evident traces of having been edited" (p. 188). But, "with the exception of ch. xxxiv. and of such passages as iv, 41-49; and x, 6-9, which may possibly have been misplaced, there is really no adequate reason why the whole should not be attributed to him" (p. 197).

DOCUMENTS OF THE CONTINENTAL REFORMATION. Edited by the Rev. B. J. KIDD, D.D. Pp. xix, 742. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1911. 12s. 6d., *net*.

We are here provided by Dr. Kidd with a collection of doc-

uments similar to that so familiar to students in Gee and Hardy's volume illustrative of English History. He has made available for the study of the Continental Reformation, and also for the Reformation in Scotland, no fewer than three hundred and fifty-one documents. These are divided into sections, and prefaced by explanatory notes with further references to works. Part I., occupying about half the book, is devoted to the Lutheran Reformation. Part II. includes the Reformed Churches of Germany and French Switzerland, Central Europe, France, the Netherlands, and Scotland. Dr. Kidd has made us all his debtor by this valuable collection, and it will permanently remain one of the indispensable aids for those who wish to study sources rather than be content with second-hand information. The book is a striking testimony to the width and fullness of the author's reading. We have only one qualification, which we are bound to make. Care should be taken in reading Dr. Kidd's Introductory Notes, for they occasionally betray that unfortunate bias against Protestantism which his other works have revealed. Thus, Luther's marriage to Catherine von Bora is described as to "an apostate nun," while in reference to Episcopacy in Denmark he invariably uses inverted commas in speaking of "consecrated" and "Bishops." It is a pity that any animus, even the slightest, should be shown in an objective work of this kind. But the documents themselves are simply invaluable, and for the provision of these we are abundantly grateful.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN FAITH AND EXPERIENCE. By A. LEWIS HUMPHRIES, M.A. Pp. xvi, 368. London: W. A. Hammond. 1911.

It is important to learn from the preface the justification of the present book among those on the Holy Spirit. The writer urges that there is a place for a discussion of the subject, "which seems to be not merely exegetical, but critical." After the endeavor to understand the Bible, our duty is to "ask how far the Biblical presentation of a certain belief or experience

can stand without qualification in the light of today"? Much of modern exegesis is criticized on the ground that "mere words have been allowed to count for too much, and sufficient care has not always been taken to get beneath them to the facts of experience." It is also thought to be vital to a true comprehension to the doctrine of the Spirit that "it should be surveyed in the light which psychology has been so generously casting on the inner side of man's religious life. Again, the author believes that "man in receiving the Holy Spirit . . . has been active rather than passive, with the result that the product needs to be interpreted in terms of both man and God." We have allowed Mr. Humphries to speak in his own words, in order that we may see something of his purpose.

But when we turn to the book itself we have to confess to great disappointment. The Old Testament is viewed from the critical standpoint of the evolutionary theory of Israel's religion (pp. 7, 24, 27). There seems to be no idea of revelation as an objective authority (p. 60); while the reference to the Holy Spirit in the prophets in Second Peter is described as "a mechanical theory of inspiration" which has "affinity with the extravagances of Montanism" (p. 39). The inspiration of the Old Testament is said to lie "in the power to perceive and express the Divine significance of the past." The New Testament is also dealt with on similar critical grounds. It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine how far the narratives of the Virgin Birth are historical or imaginative (p. 124), and so we ought to be content with the broad conviction that the existence of Jesus Christ in the world had its origin and explanation in the power of God (p. 131). The Temptation has in it nothing, which, viewed from the human side, "cannot be explained by psychology as belonging to an intense mental experience" (p. 136). Pentecost is explained from its subjective side (p. 174). The early Christians "associated the Holy Spirit simply with the abnormal . . . until Paul taught them a truer view" (p. 194). New Testament terminology is said to be "an attempt to express an experience, and moves within the limits which that experience prescribed."

It will be seen from these references, which are typical of the writer's entire attitude, that the book cannot be regarded as satisfactory to those who believe that the Old and New Testaments have objective authority prior to and independent of human receptivity and experience. The discussion, while helpful in many points for its suggestions, needs to be checked and safeguarded at every stage by a belief in that Holy Spirit Who spake by the Prophets and through the Son. It is impossible to avoid certain thoughts arising in the mind as we contemplate the Primitive Methodist source of this book. It is not along these lines that the early Primitive Methodism gained its great spiritual victories, and unless we are greatly mistaken, such teaching on the authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture given to Primitive Methodist students for the ministry will not provide any guarantee of a continuance of spiritual power.

W. H. G. T.

THE RESURRECTION AND MODERN THOUGHT. By W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D. 8vo. Pp. vi, 464. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. \$4.00, *net*.

Those who have read Dr. Sparrow Simpson's earlier volume, and his article on the same subject contributed to Hastings's "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels," will be glad to give a hearty welcome to this larger treatment, especially as it possesses all the features that made the earlier works so acceptable. It must be said at once that this is the fullest and ablest discussion of the Resurrection that we have in English. It will be conclusive for almost every believer, and ought to do much to silence opposition. The plan of the work consists of four books, dealing respectively with "The Witness of the Twelve," "The Witness of St. Paul," "The Theology of the Resurrection," and "The Resurrection and Modern Thought." Dr. Simpson remarks that many writings on the Resurrection concentrate attention mainly upon its evidences while tending to neglect its theology. The present work aims at dealing with both aspects of the great truth. In the first book the appearances of our Lord are thoroughly examined and tested,

and the author's ability, candor, and fullness of treatment are evident on almost every page. The witness of St. Paul is also considered with great thoroughness in six chapters. Every aspect of the subject is brought forward, and there is a particularly valuable discussion of the modern idea of the relations of our Lord to St. Paul. The third book, dealing with the theology of the Resurrection, is the largest and most important and will be found of immense value by every student. Here and there the author will not carry his readers with him, but this was perhaps to be expected on so profound a theme. The last six chapters of this section deal with the resurrection of the body; and after a discussion of St. Paul's doctrine, we are introduced to "Patristic Teaching," "Formulas of the Church," "Post-Reformation English Teaching," and "Modern Roman Teaching." It will be seen how complete a treatment this gives. Dr. Simpson is clearly opposed to what he regards as the materialistic Latin view of the resurrection of the body, and he favors the more philosophic Greek interpretation. We are not sure, however, that he has said the last word on this topic, but no one can read this full and clear discussion without increasing his information on a question of supreme importance. The fourth book consists of four chapters, discussing in turn "The Documents Considered as Evidence," "Christ's Resurrection and Physical Research," "Historical Judgments and Dogmatic Judgments," and "Christ's Resurrection as an Object of Faith." These titles show how thoroughly modern is the discussion. Dr. Simpson rightly rejects the evidence from psychical research on several grounds, but mainly because it seeks to establish immortality on a scientific foundation while divorcing immortality from God. The Ritschlian theory of "Value Judgments" is ably and forcibly discussed, and the closing chapter is one of great spiritual impressiveness.

That Dr. Simpson's work is scholarly and well-informed goes without saying, for it is abreast of all that has been written on the subject down to Wrede and Weinl. No criticism seems to have been overlooked, and every writer of repute has

been faced. The treatment of Strauss, Baur, and Weinel is particularly good. We also value the candor of the discussions, and the interpretations of Scripture passages are almost wholly convincing and satisfying. We particularly like the discussion on "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." Another point of first-rate importance is the relation of St. Paul to the teaching of Christ (p. 203). Dr. Simpson, after a careful and thorough study of recent German critical theology on the Resurrection, significantly points out that these rationalistic critics agree that "if the orthodox belief in the Person of Jesus Christ is held there is no critical problem left."

The book will at once take its place as among the leading authorities on its great subject, and we thank the author for a profound service to the cause of truth by this thorough, exhaustive, and satisfactory discussion. It will be a quarry from which students will draw material for many a day. We observe that the proofs need attention in several places (pp. 204, 206, 227, 266, 448).

W. H. G. T.

THE PROGRESS OF REVELATION: Sermons Chiefly on the Old Testament. By the Rev. G. A. Cooke, D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, Oxford; Canon of Rochester; Hon. Canon of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester and to the Bishop of Edinburgh. 8vo. Pp. xii, 200. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.75, *net*.

This volume contains twenty-one sermons, averaging eight pages each. The style is perspicuous and forceable, and a deep spirit of spirituality pervades the series. But the value of several of the discourses is much impaired by the author's overconfident acceptance of groundless higher critical theories. The author takes pains to assert that Abram is merely "the idealized ancestor" of the Jewish race, that the "servant of Jehovah" in Isa. liii. is not an individual, and that the first chapter of Genesis contains numerous erroneous statements.

1. That animals appeared earlier than vegetation, and so the work as described on the second day in Genesis is false. The author has no ground for this statement; but, on the other hand, the Bible statement is supported by geological facts of clearest import.

2. The author asserts that vegetation could not have existed before the events described in the fourth day. Evidently, however, the author is entirely ignorant of the nebular hypothesis, and has not given attention to the proper exegesis of the verses describing the work of that day.

3. The author denies that birds and fishes were made together. But they were made in the same period, and Genesis is correct. Both birds and fishes appear in the Mesozoic era before the creation of the Mammalia attributed to the fifth day.

4. Our author states that "in Gen. i. 29 and 30 it is expressly provided that man and all the animals are to live upon vegetable food; but such a condition of life can never have existed" (p. 117). But the passage does not say that they are limited to that food; while the basis of all animal food is vegetable, for the carnivorous animals are dependent upon their vegetable-eating companions.

LOLLARDY AND THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND. Volume III.
By JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B., LL.D., D.Litt. Pp. xliii, 415.
New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. \$3.50, *net*.

The third volume of a great work by a scholar who perhaps knows more than any other living man about the main facts and movements of which he writes. His official position in England has given him the opportunity of research and information which are necessarily unavailable to most writers, and his knowledge is encyclopædic, nothing seems to escape him. And yet we are compelled to say that with all his profound knowledge, Dr. Gairdner seems incapable of judging the Reformation aright. This bias of judgment was noted and severely criticized in the former volumes, and Dr. Gairdner spends time in the introduction of this work in endeavoring

to justify his position, though we do not think he is at all successful in the attempt. He fully recognizes that the great problem is the cause or causes of the Reformation. But as we read his pages we find ourselves asking again and again whether anything like all the factors have been taken into consideration. In spite of his declaration that he has never felt the least personal inclination towards the Church of Rome (p. x), his partiality and even tenderness for that Communion are manifest almost everywhere. He appears to us to fail entirely to meet Canon Bigg's criticism of his use of the term "heretic" (p. xiii).

It is almost impossible to understand the attitude of one who can write that "Christian truth, having been laid down by authority, disturbers, or heretics, had to be removed somehow or other, after repeated unavailing admonitions" (p. xxii). More to the same effect in the same paragraph reveals Dr. Gairdner's spirit. He does not believe that the Reformation in England, or elsewhere, was due to moral indignation against evil in the Church (p. xxxix). He considers that general morality was worse under Edward VI. than it had been before, and that it perhaps improved somewhat under Mary. Dr. Gairdner's opinion is that the Reformation in England "was due really to the King's action against the Pope by which Papal jurisdiction was entirely abrogated." Surely there is distinct confusion here between occasion and cause, especially when we are told that the essence of the English Reformation was "secular power, indeed secular tyranny . . . gradually mollified by the recognition of vital truths in the keeping of that Church which it oppressed, but never could disown" (p. xl).

The author's attitude to doctrine is seen in the statement that "whatever is accepted as orthodoxy in any Communion is really the fruit of the ages of discussion which may be supposed to have settled the matter" (p. xli), while we have the astounding view that doctrines do not really divide Christians so much as they appear to do. Dr. Gairdner questions whether many Roman Catholics have really heartfelt belief in Transubstantiation, and whether many Protestants have a

heartfelt belief in Justification by Faith. "I am pretty sure that very many are quite ready, even now, to repudiate it over their wine-glasses with superficial levity in the way described by Cowper" (p. xliii). It will be seen from this Introduction what Dr. Gairdner feels about the Reformation, and his book is in keeping with these opening remarks. He has a very special regard for Bishop Gardiner (pp. 11, 39, 205, 216, 242), and he sneers at Protestants like Bale (p. 30), Hancock (p. 65), Ponet (p. 243), Holgate (p. 244), and Knox (p. 338). But we cannot find any such remarks about men in the opposite camp, like Gardiner and Bonner. On the contrary, even the Inquisition is said to have shown "fervent zeal for righteousness" (p. 164). Hooper comes in for specially severe treatment; he is a "quondam monk," and his Protestant views, looked at from Dr. Gairdner's standpoint, are heretical tendencies. But our author admits, and does it handsomely, that Hooper was a thorough success as a Bishop (pp. 178-281). Mary's letter to Edward is described as "this very earnest letter of a woman cruelly wounded in her most sacred feelings through the instrumentality of a young brother educated in unkindness by a political faction" (p. 199). And in harmony with this general attitude, Edward is spoken of as "His little Majesty," and Henry VIII. as "after a certain fashion a man of principle."

Dr. Gairdner's doctrinal partiality is seen in the way he refers to the history of the Anglican Articles, for in speaking of the doctrine of the Real Presence he does not, so far as we can see, call attention to the significance of Article XXIX., which Archbishop Parker introduced in 1563 and successfully passed in 1571. But all historians ought to recognize that this is the key to a very important situation. In the same way, Dr. Gairdner has no real conception of the meaning of Justification by Faith only, for he regards the statement of Archbishop Cranmer that "we are justified without charity," as a conclusion which it would be difficult to defend (p. 39). One of the most striking instances of the author's inability to see the true position and perspective of affairs is the way in which he

refers to Archbishop Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine, as shown in that prelate's well-known book. Dr. Gairdner calls it "an amazing thing for an Archbishop of Canterbury to condemn outright in this fashion the eucharistic doctrine of a long line of predecessors." Surely Cranmer had some reason for dissociating himself from the mediæval doctrine of Communion.

We would not for a moment wish the Reformers and the political leaders of Edward's reign held up as paragons of virtue (far from it), but we cannot help feeling that Dr. Gairdner's bias is much too evident. We are more than ready to admit mistakes, crimes, and sins on the part of those who were responsible for the Reformation. But we must distinguish between movements and men, and it is the significance of the movement that Dr. Gairdner cannot recognize. His attitude is something like that of Erasmus, recognizing abuses, and yet unable, or unwilling, to correct them. Such conservatism and Erastianism would never have brought about the necessary changes. Our chief criticism, therefore, is that Dr. Gairdner entirely fails to account for the Reformation, and he insists that the political element determined the matter far more than the theological (p. 267). But he does not at all see how it was that the common people in Edward's time so widely accepted the principles of the new religion, or how, in Elizabeth's reign, coercion notwithstanding, the reformed religion was maintained by the nation. When we turn to a book like Lindsay's "History of the Reformation," we are enabled to penetrate below the surface in a way that Dr. Gairdner never enables us to do. As the English *Spectator* lately remarked: "The Reformation conquered not by virtue of its negations, but in the strength of its positive ideas. It was the new faith in God through Christ, kindled by the English Bible, that burnt up the false mediæval notions as so much hay and stubble."

It is such an appreciation of a great spiritual movement, thus started, fed, and fostered, which we do not find in Dr. Gairdner. But we are grateful to him for the mass of facts which he has provided for study and from which we can draw our own conclusions.

W. H. G. T.

GOD IN EVOLUTION: A Pragmatic Study of Theology. By FRANCIS HOWE JOHNSON, author of "What is Reality?" 8vo. Pp. vii, 354. New York, London, Bombay, Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1911.

In January, 1892, we gave a favorable notice of Mr. Johnson's former volume, "What is Reality?" a work which, in a remarkable degree, forecast the line of speculation concerning the nature of things which has been followed by many writers since, among whom might be specially mentioned Professors Bowne and James. It is gratifying, therefore, after this long delay, to receive the present volume, containing the author's application of the principles developed in his preceding work to ultimate problems of the present day. From beginning to end the present volume bears marks of the author's familiarity with the developments of modern science and philosophy, and profound insight into the essential problems which are agitating modern religious thought. He acutely notes (p. 12) that the modern word "pragmatic" "stands for the larger transforming principle that is bringing the antagonistic aspects [the deductive and the inductive method] of our thought together." An interesting illustration of this is found in his postulate that it is "a fair inference that the Creator's character is expressed to us in those qualities that He has made us, the most highly developed of his creatures, to recognize as the highest" (p. 116); for it is by the acceptance of such ideals that mankind attains its most desirable ends. The volume is full of such unexpected applications of profound principles. For example, a closing thought in the chapter on "Experience and Will" is beautifully expressed as follows: "In evolution, the revelation of all reality as one great world-process moving toward constructions of higher and still higher values, we have a most instructive and sufficient warrant for the assumption that, when we have discovered that which makes for its furtherance in the line of highest achievement, we have grasped something which we may safely hold to be an independent reality" (p. 276).

Especially forceful is the author's argument for design

drawn from the impression made upon the mind from the contemplation of nature, which is compared to that made by a picture which, by chemical analysis, is resolved into a mass of heterogeneous, unmeaning crudities, but which in their combination reveal the presence of a moving human spirit like our own. Dr. Johnson's work meets a deeply felt want of the present time, and can hardly help winning for itself a wide circulation.

DIVINE TRANSCENDENCE. By J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A., D.D. Pp. xvi, 255. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. \$1.75, *net*.

Dr. Illingworth has made us all so deeply his debtor that anything from his pen instantly commands attention and respect. His "Personality," "Divine Immanence," and "Reason and Revelation" are invaluable for their purposes, and will long remain to inform and guide us. The present work is described as a complement to his book "Divine Immanence," and the theme is important and eminently worthy of Dr. Illingworth's great powers. In the first four chapters he attacks the problem under the following titles: "Effect of Psychological Bias," "Relative and Absolute Being," "The Theistic Arguments," and "Transcendence and Authority"; and all that he says calls for the most careful consideration. In these sections he reveals much of his great power which we have learned to value and enjoy. But suddenly and unexpectedly in Chapter V. the whole atmosphere of the book is changed, and we are introduced to topics of a very definite ecclesiastical type. Dr. Illingworth is of course known to belong to the school of extreme Anglicans represented by "Lux Mundi," but hitherto he has kept pretty free from anything purely ecclesiastical. Here, however, he gives us chapters on "The Authority of the Church," "The Authority of the Creed," "The Authority of Sacraments," "The Authority of the Old Testament," "The Authority of the New Testament," and "Christian Life under Authority." The order of these chapters, with Church, Creed, and Sacraments before the

Bible, will not escape notice, and we certainly did not expect Dr. Illingworth to give references to authority on Episcopacy including the names of Hooker, Gore, Moberly, and Darwell Stone, without so much as a hint that Lightfoot, Hatch, Hort, and Sanday might also be considered eminently worthy of attention. It is incredible that a broad-minded and scholarly man should associate himself with so obscurantist, unscholarly, and narrow a position, for which so little can be said, and against which so much is being urged by the ablest and finest scholarship of the day.

W. H. G. T.

THE FIVE GREAT PHILOSOPHIES OF LIFE. By WILLIAM DE WITT HYDE, President of Bowdoin College. 12mo. Pp. x, 296. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. \$1.50, *net*.

This volume is a new edition of one published under the title "From Epicurus to Christ." But the last chapter, "The Christian Spirit of Love," has been rewritten and enlarged. In this chapter, after a comprehensive and illuminating discussion of love, the author reaches the conclusion that Christianity has room for the joys of sense and heart which Epicurus taught us to prize aright; the Stoic's strength, which calls for the sacrifice of minor good to that which is universal; the humility demanded by Plato; and the submissiveness of our own interests to the practical usefulness of social progress enjoined by Aristotle. Such a comprehensive study, as our author gives, of love in the sense of "good-will," or "benevolence," as the guiding star of humanity, frees the mind from the many misconceptions with which we approach the interpretation of human conduct and human legislation. Respecting the activity of the church in its aims to limit divorces, the author says, "The Christian church makes a serious mistake when it spends its energies in trying to build up legal barriers against divorce" (p. 233); "Laws and prohibitions, statutes and penalties against drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, theft, murder, gambling, and divorce, we must have. But those laws and penalties are best devised

and enforced by the state, as the representative of the average sentiment of the community as a whole, rather than by the distinctively Christian element in the community, which in the nature of things is very far above the average sentiment" (p. 234).

EVERYMAN'S RELIGION. By GEORGE HODGES. 12mo. Pp. iv, 297. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. \$1.50, *net*.

This collection of fifteen essays is readable, instructive, and uplifting from beginning to end. There are few points upon which we care to criticize the author; but there is one. On page 50, in the essay on "Religion and Revelation," a number of things in the Bible are set down as actual errors; but in every case we should say that the errors are those of the author's interpretation, and not of the Bible. The essay on "Religion and Miracle" is specially discriminating and helpful. The author ably defends the following positions: "The miraculous will endure by reason of a fact in psychology: the fact of the reality of the will" (p. 80); "A denial of the miraculous is an affirmation of the impotence of God. It maintains that we live in a closed universe. It substitutes an unregarding law for a paternal personality. It contradicts the free will of God. God must work miracles in order to assure us of His presence and His care" (p. 81).

DOES PRAYER AVAIL? By WILLIAM W. KINSLEY, author of "Man's Tomorrow," "Views on Vexed Questions," "Old Faiths and New Facts," etc. 12mo. Pp. 157. Boston: Sherman, French and Company. 1911. \$1.00, *net*.

That the human will should direct the forces of nature to the accomplishment of results not incorporated into the causally connected sequences of the universe is as mysterious as that God should interfere to modify those sequences. That the forces of nature are many of them in such unstable equilibrium that they are easily directed by will power, both human and divine, is shown by the author in innumerable illustrations.

By a variety of illustrations he also shows that man is a being of such inherent worth that his interests are properly the object of divine regard, and, furthermore, that prayer is a proper condition to be made before certain blessings are bestowed upon him. The volume will prove very interesting and helpful to all classes of readers. The only questionable position maintained by the author is that the foreknowledge of the actions of man's free-will is not perfect. But in this he is in accord with many orthodox Arminian divines.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Edited by SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D. Complete in Twelve Volumes. 8vo. Volume XI. SON OF MAN—TREMELLIUS (pp. xx, 504). New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company. Complete, \$60; per volume, \$5.00.

The timeliness of this volume appears in the well-selected and numerous short biographical sketches of living biblical scholars and theologians; also in the number of the longer articles relating to modern movements in the religious world, these for the most part being additions by American writers. Among these may be specially mentioned "South Sea Islands, Missions in the," "Spain, Evangelical Work in," "Student Volunteers," "Sunday-schools" (twenty-eight columns), "Sweden" (twenty columns), "Switzerland" (eighteen columns), "Symbolism" (twenty-six columns), "Syria" and "Syriac Literature" (thirty columns), "Theological Education" and "Theological Seminaries" (one hundred and twenty-eight columns). Every theological seminary in the United States is described by a member of its faculty. Other articles of special length are "Stars," "Stenography," "Stichometry," "Superstition," "Swedenborg," "Synagogue," "Syncretism," "Talmud," "Tammuz-Adonis," and "Time." Very few of the articles touch upon the disputed questions of biblical criticism. We notice, however, that the one on "Tabernacle," written by Professor Kittel, falls into the ordinary errors of the Wellhausen crit-

ics in finding numerous discrepancies between the account of the tabernacle in Ex. xxv. ff. and Ex. xxxiii. 7 ff., all of which have been shown by Van Hoonacker and Wiener to arise from a misunderstanding, by the critics, of the conditions and things described.

THE MIND OF PRIMITIVE MAN. By FRANK BOAS. A Course of Lectures delivered before the Lowell Institute, Boston, Mass., and the National University of Mexico, 1910-1911. Pp. x, 294. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911.

In this volume the distinguished author defends the propositions that there is a substantial equality in the native mental ability of all races of mankind; that the inferiority of races is due not to any lack of native ability, but to the accidents which have prevented them from sharing in the fruits of the discoveries made by individual geniuses. He finds that "the characteristics of the osseus, muscular, visceral, or circulatory system, have practically no direct relation to the mental ability of man" (Manouvrier); and that the size of the brain is so nearly alike in all races, that no inferences can be drawn from the facts collected. "It is not impossible that the smaller brains of males of other races should do the same work as is done by the larger brain of the white race" (p. 27). He contends that "the civilizations of ancient Peru and Central America may well be compared with the ancient civilizations of the Old World" (p. 7). In view of his investigations the author does not fear the effects of the intermingling of races in America. The volume is one of exceeding interest.

WHY I AM NOT A HIGHER CRITIC. By the Rev. W. St. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D., author of "The Noble Eightfold Path," "The Religion of the Crescent," "The Original Sources of the Qur'ân," "Religio Critici," etc.; late James Long Lecturer on Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, and Comparative Religion. Pp. 29. London: Morgan and Scott, Ltd. Paper.

An excellent, concise criticism of prevailing theories concerning the Old Testament, by a scholar of great eminence, all to be had for five cents. We wish for it a wide circulation.

THE FOUR FACES, and Other Sermons. By P. S. HENSON, D.D., LL.D. 12mo. Pp. 256. Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, and Toronto: The Griffith and Rowland Press. 1911. \$1.00, *net*.

Fourteen stimulating and helpful sermons from one of America's most effective preachers.

A WAY OF HONOR, and Other College Sermons. By HENRY KINGMAN, D.D. 12mo. Pp. 210. New York, Chicago, Toronto, London, and Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1911. \$1.00, *net*.

All of Dr. King's discourses are readable and helpful, but that upon "The Sinlessness of Jesus" is specially so.

CHARLES DARWIN AND OTHER ENGLISH THINKERS, with Reference to their Religious and Ethical Value. By S. PARKES CADMAN. A Series of Lectures delivered before the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences during the Autumn of 1910. Pp. ix, 284. Boston, New York, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 1911. \$1.25, *net*.

An excellent summary of the views of Darwin, Huxley, Mill, Martineau, and Matthew Arnold, with a fairly just estimate of their work in the molding of modern thought.

THROUGH THE MILL: The Life of a Mill-boy. By AL PRIDDY. 8vo. Pp. xi, 289. Boston: The Pilgrim Press. \$1.35, *net*.

This autobiography of a mill-boy, originally published in the *Outlook*, has been entirely rewritten and new chapters have been added, so as to make it practically a new book. The story is all the more depressing because true. But all the better it forces upon us the greatest problem of the present time, How can we properly adjust the relations between our great industrial enterprises and the human factors necessary to carry them on?

The Sunday School Times Company, Philadelphia.

THE MINISTER'S SOCIAL HELPER. By THERESA HUNT WOLCOTT. 12mo. Pp. 364. \$1.00, *net*.

**Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, Toronto,
London, and Edinburgh.**

THE PEDAGOGICS OF PREACHING; Being the Substance of Lectures given at the Hartley College, Manchester, in 1910 and 1911. By **THISELTON MARK, D.Litt., B.Sc.,** Lecturer on Education at the University of Manchester, and on Sunday-School Pedagogics at Theological Colleges affiliated with the University Faculty of Theology; Author of "The Teacher and the Child," "The Unfolding of Personality as the Chief Aim of Education." 12mo. Pp. 92. 50 cents, *net*.

The Pilgrim Press, Boston, New York, and Chicago.

PETER IN THE FIRELIGHT. By **WILLIAM ALLEN KNIGHT,** author of "The Song of our Syrian Guest," etc. 60 cents, *net*.

SAVED BY HOPE. By **J. SPARHAWK JONES,** author of "The Invisible Things" and "Seeing Darkly." 12mo. Pp. 206. \$1.00.

THE SCHOOL OF LIFE. By **WASHINGTON GLADDEN.** Pp. 32. 25 cents, *net*.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York City.

PERIODICAL ARTICLES ON RELIGION, 1890-1899. Compiled and Edited by **ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON.** With the Co-operation of Charles S. Thayer, William C. Hawks, Paul Martin, and various members of the faculty of the Hartford Theological Seminary, and some help from A. D. Savage, Solon Librescot, and many others. Author Index. 8vo. Pp. 876. \$10.00, *net*.

The Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

PLAIN ANSWERS TO RELIGIOUS QUESTIONS Modern Men Are Asking. By **SAMUEL CHARLES BLACK, D.D.,** Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Boulder, Colo., Instructor in Hebrew, University of Colorado. With an Introduction by Howard Agnew Johnston, D.D. 12mo. Pp. 203. 75 cents, *net*.

PRISCA OF PATMOS: A Tale of the Days of St. John. By **HENRY C. MCCOOK, D.D., Sc.D., LL.D.,** author of "The Latimers," "Tenants of an Old Town," "Old Farm Fancies," "Quaker Ben," etc. 12mo. Pp. 318. \$1.25, *net*.

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT
D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

40 illustrations, 450 pages, 12mo, cloth. \$2.00, net; postage, 17 cents

"A second reading of this most timely and really beautifully written book has very greatly increased our admiration for it."—*Canadian Churchman*.

"For a long time to come every one who has to write upon the Deluge, or touch that wider subject of the attitude of the Old Testament to the phenomena of nature, will require to know what is written in this book."—*The Expository Times*.

"This volume bids fair to be recognized as the standard work on the important subject of Penateuchal physics."—Professor G. MACLEOD in *The Princeton Theological Review*.

"No thoughtful mind—no sincere searcher for the truth—can give due consideration to the vast accumulation of scientific facts strung by the author in this volume and fail to be confirmed in a belief in the accuracy of the historical statements of the Old Testament."—*The Churchman* (London).

"The book is of interest because it shows how wonderfully the account given of the Creation in Genesis harmonizes with the scientific data in regard to the different stages of creation and evolution."—*Dublin Express*.

"The appearance of Dr. Wright's book at the present juncture is extremely opportune. . . . Archaeology came to the defence of the Bible a generation ago; we believe that science is here following in like sort."—*The Record*.

"... und nach reifem Studium müssen wir das Aussehen gerechtfertigt finden, das sein Erscheinen in den Ländern englischer Zunge erregt hat."

"Schon die Gesundheit der Auslegungsgrundsätze ist anzuerkennen, die er nehmend an mehreren Stellen einschärft."—KONRAD KÖNIG in *Die Reformationszeitung*.

"The last chapter Genesis and Science is the best discussion of its subject we have seen. The whole book is strengthening and even inspiring. Whoever would be posted should get this admirable work."—Dr. T. T. LARON in *The Western Recorder*.

"Wright is een helder denker, wat hij schrijft loopt glad en is doordachtig. . . ."

"Insi di mi vet aan zijn woord gezag hij. Hij scheept u niet met een praatje voor den vak af, maar hij drijft diep in de oeren hem liggende vraagstukken in, want zich meester op het terrein dat hij beoogt."—Dr. A. KATERS in his Introduction to the Dutch Edition.

Bibliotheca Sacra Company
OBERLIN, OHIO

The Ice Age in North America and Its Bearing Upon the Antiquity of Man

By G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

**New Thoroughly Revised and Greatly Enlarged (5th)
Edition, 200 Illustrations, 800 Pages, 8vo, cloth,
\$5.00 net; postage, 25 cents.**

"The 'Ice Age in North America' I regard as one of the treasures of my book-shelves."—*Sir Denham Ball.*

"Its lucid presentation of the subject has made it popular among students, and it is the most convenient compilation in existence of the Testimony of the glacial period."—*Professor CHARLES H. DITCHCOCK.*

"The book meets the demand of both popular interest and a scientific accuracy."—*Daily Picayune (New Orleans).*

"The volume is a classic in this field of geology, and the new edition, printed in good, clear type, on the very best of paper, will be welcomed by geologists throughout the world."—*San Francisco Bulletin.*

"No specialist in geology in any part of the world ever thinks of being without this book, which is now in its fifth edition greatly enlarged, revised up to the latest contribution to the science."—*Journal of Education.*

"The whole subject is an immense one, and Dr. WRIGHT has dealt with it with a full and patient mind."—*Contemporary Review.*

"One of the most important scientific publications of the present year. . . The volume should be given a place in every important public and school library."—*Hopkinton Republican.*

"The book is profusely illustrated by photographs, maps and diagrams and should make a special appeal to all practical students."—*London Daily News.*

Bibliotheca Sacra Company
OBERLIN, OHIO

THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITED BY

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

WILLIAM D. HAYES, JAMES H. HAYES, CHARLES F. HAYES, HENRY HAYES,
 PHILIP A. S. HALL, WILLIAM S. HAYES, HENRY A. HAYES,
 JAMES W. HAYES, A. S. HAYES, MELVIN S. HAYES,
 W. D. HAYES, HAYES

CONTENTS

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES MARSH HEAD, BY HIS FRIENDS	George F. Hayes	100
CHURCH IN THE FOUR CORNERS	Edward B. Gardner	100
THE DIVORCE PROBLEM	Charles Hayes	100
CATHOLICISM AND AMERICANISM	Samuel Hays	100
THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS CONCERNING JESUS	William Hays	100
SOME ASPECTS OF THE CONSERVATIVE TARIFF IN RELATION TO COTTON	Harold M. Winer	100
THE CHURCHES OF THE BOOK OF RUTH	Samuel Hays	100
LITURGICAL NOTE		100
THE CHURCH IN THE CATHOLICITY WITH THE CATHOLIC	Samuel Hays	100
NOTES ON THE CHURCH IN THE CATHOLICITY		100

PUBLISHED BY THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

100 N. 10th St., St. Paul, Minn.
 100 N. 10th St., St. Paul, Minn.

SINGLE COPIES, 10 CENTS

TERMS, \$3.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1891, under No. 100, Post Office at St. Paul, Minn., authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917.

The Origin of the Pentateuch

A (Vigant) Defense of the Mosaic Authorship, in Popular Form.

By CAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B.

150 pages, 8vo, paper, 40 cents, postpaid.

Mr. Wiener's volumes and articles "are a successful attack on the critical views now current."—*Dr. WILLIS J. BROWN*.

"Its plan . . . is supported by terse reasoning, and learning which endues it to a most successful and attractive learning."—*Professor JAMES OUS*.

By the same author

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism

Contains the Detailed Discussion of the Various points in the More Popular Presentation.

224 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$1.50, postpaid.

"A mass of learned observation and argument which cannot be disregarded."

—*The Very Reverend Henry WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury.*

"The decision of a jurist like Mr. Wiener is of great value where the origin and identity of laws are disputed."—*The Tablet (London).*

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

Second Edition. Forty Illustrations, 160 pages, 12mo, cloth, \$2.00, net; postpaid, 17 cents.

"For a long time to come every one who has to write upon the Deluge, or touch that wider subject of the attitude of the Old Testament to the phenomena of nature, will require to know what is written in this book."—*The Evangelist*.

MIRACLE AND SCIENCE

Bible Miracles Examined by the Methods, Rules and Tests of the Science of Jurisprudence as Administered To-day in Courts of Justice.

By FRANCIS J. LAMB, Attorney and Counsellor at Law

350 pages, 12mo, cloth, \$3.50, net; postpaid, 12 cents.

"It is long since the reviewer read so strong and satisfying a book."

—*Professor WILLIAM DENTON GREENE, Jr.*

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

Being a Consideration of the Historical Value of the Biblical View of the Nature of That Person.

By the late President EDWARD G. MERRELL, D.D., LL.D.

102 pages, 12mo, cloth, 50 cents, net; postage, 10 cents.

"The book adds another to the list of strong volumes that have been issued by this company in defense of Christ and the Bible."—*Alfred A. Andrews (Harrisburg).*

WHY I AM NOT A HIGHER CRITIC

By Rev. W. ST. CLAIR THOMAS, D.D.

20 pages, paper, 10 cents, postpaid.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLES MARSH MEAD, BY HIS FRIENDS.

EDITED BY GEORGE NYE BOARDMAN, NEW YORK CITY.

MANY friends of Professor Mead have requested that some permanent record of his life and work be prepared for publication. As a mere child he manifested an unusual diversity of natural gifts, and in every stage of his career he was the object of affection and high esteem. A few of his friends have accordingly coöperated in preparing this brief biography, for which Mrs. Mead, for more than forty years his constant companion, has furnished the dates and several other items.

Charles Marsh Mead was born in Cornwall, Vermont, on January 28, 1836. He was the son of Rufus and Anna (Janes) Mead. His boyhood was passed in one of those typical New England homes to which this country owes so much and in which many of her greatest men have been molded. He himself, when near the end of his life he read Curtis's admirable biography of Daniel Webster, was greatly struck with the many points of resemblance in the family life of the Websters and the Meads. Rufus Mead, like Ebenezer Webster, was a farmer who appreciated the value of study and of mental training. Although not rich, and with a family of nine chil-

Vol. LXIX. No. 274. 1

dren, he laid by his little contributions for the aid of the College near by him in Middlebury, and in recent years one receipt has been found among old family papers crediting him with a gift of \$100 to it.

Charles was the youngest of seven sons, he had two sisters older than the brothers. Rufus Mead had the pleasure of seeing three of the sons become graduates from the college in which he had taken such interest, all of them doing credit to it and to him. Anna Janes, his wife, was the sister of Deacon Horace Janes, whose memory is still enshrined in the church at Cornwall. He and his other sister, Lucy (Janes) Bond, had homesteads not far distant in the town of Cornwall. Deacon Janes and the two sisters had numerous children, counting twenty-four when they sat down together at the Thanksgiving table. Charles was the youngest of the twenty-four cousins. Like the Websters, the Meads helped each other in their educational efforts. The eldest sister was unwearied in her endeavors to aid her brothers. She was a teacher of high reputation until deafness obliged her to give over work of that kind. For a time she taught in La Prairie, Canada, where Charles was with her nearly a year (1845-46). There he heard, and learned to speak, the French language. In 1849 this sister was the preceptress of the Female Seminary in Middlebury, where she had under her tuition two brothers, Charles and Martin, the latter of whom was two years the elder. An older brother, Hiram, later professor at Oberlin, Ohio, after graduating from Middlebury taught two years in the Flushing Institute, New York. Here, for about a year, he took the younger brothers to complete their preparation for college. In 1852 the three became connected with Middlebury College, Hiram as tutor, Martin a Sophomore, Charles a Freshman, though able to enter a year in advance.

In the winter of 1850-51, the Rev. Asa Hemenway served as pastor of the church in Cornwall. Under his ministry much religious interest was awakened among the young people. Charles always looked back to a drive home from meeting one evening as the time when he accepted forgiveness, and silently devoted himself to God. From that time forth his Christian life seems to have grown quietly with the steady purpose and progress characteristic of him. In July, 1852, after their return from Flushing and before entering college, both Martin and Charles joined the Congregational Church in Cornwall.

In 1856 Charles was graduated from Middlebury as valedictorian. A Professor during the last three years of his course, an honored and much-loved friend during the remainder of his life, writes: "I became acquainted with Professor Mead when he was a Sophomore in college, and was greatly attracted to him. I spoke of him to President Labaree, and he responded, 'Beautiful character, beautiful.' I had great pleasure in his eminently successful course at Middlebury, and in his progress in subsequent years." Another and younger friend writes: "I remember him as far back as when he gave his valedictory. . . . I still remember the impression it made on my boyish heart. I thought it was one of the finest addresses I had ever heard, and I have not changed my opinion in the more than fifty years that have gone by." After his graduation he taught from 1856 to 1858 in the classical department of Phillips Academy at Andover, Massachusetts. One of his pupils there writes: "My contact with him as his pupil at Andover and my all-too-infrequent meetings with him during our busy lives are precious memories for me now. He was a *companionable* teacher."

In 1858 he entered Andover Seminary and began his studies

for the ministry, that profession to which he had for years looked forward. When he had finished his Junior year he again helped out his resources by teaching, and spent the year of 1859-60 as tutor in Middlebury College. In 1859 he delivered his Master's oration there and received the degree of A.M. One of his pupils writes: "He was my tutor in Middlebury College when I entered in 1859, and I formed a great admiration for him as a man and as a most helpful teacher. He was so thorough in his work, and his insistence in requiring us to do our best was so mixed with justice, that I cannot remember that any of the boys were rebellious or inclined to think him too severe. I have ever since my freshman year felt proud that he was my early tutor." In 1860 Charles resumed his studies at Andover, and he was graduated in 1862.

In the autumn of that year he preached for a few weeks at North Adams, Massachusetts; but his Professors at Andover, and other friends, strongly advised him to pursue further studies in Europe. One of his former brothers lent him assistance to do so, and in February, 1863, he started in a sailing vessel for Europe. Professor Park of Andover had given him a letter to Rev. William Fairfield Warren, then theological Professor in Bremen, in the Seminary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who now writes: "From the year of his graduation from Andover I have known and loved him. His first night in Germany was spent under my roof, and from that first meeting onward we were fast friends. His keenness of insight, transparency of character, appreciation of all things noble, his amiability, devotedness, and happy humor, made him a personality of rare and irresistible attractiveness." In April he settled in Halle in the family of Professor Jacobi. The Professor and his family were his fast friends through life. In Halle, he formed a friendship with Professor Tho-

luck, with whom he became a great favorite. The Professor had adjacent to his house a long promenade in which he was accustomed to take exercise in all weathers, and which was popularly called his *Rennbahn*. He often invited Charles to walk with him there, and they would walk and talk together for hours. From 1864 to 1866 most of his time was spent in Berlin, where he became intimate with Professor Isaac Dorner, and was with him again a favorite pupil. He was also a frequent visitant at Professor Piper's and Professor Messner's, and he made many other dear German friends. In Berlin he became a member of the Sing Akademie, then under the direction of the celebrated Grell, and in its meetings he found much recreation. He shared the family gift for music, and had a tenor voice of remarkable richness and power. In August of 1865 he received an appointment to the Hitchcock Professorship of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary. The following year was spent largely in preparation to teach in that department. In 1866 he spent a short time at Tübingen, and received the degree of Ph.D. from its University.

In July of 1866 he returned to the United States by way of Scotland and England. On August 10, he was ordained for the ministry in Cornwall, his native town, Professor Park of Andover preaching the sermon, and his brother Hiram giving the charge. In the early autumn he was inaugurated Professor at Andover, and entered on his new duties. His colleague at Andover, who occupied the chair of Greek Exegesis, was Dr. J. Henry Thayer, who had been a classmate and intimate friend of his brother Hiram, when they were students at Andover. On August 2, 1867, he married Caroline Thayer, Professor Thayer's youngest sister. Their married life was a peculiarly happy one. Professor Mead was eminently do-

mestic in his tastes, and they were never so happy as when in each other's society, engaged in kindred pursuits.

Before speaking of Professor Mead's work at Andover it will be in place to notice his career as a student. At Middlebury he took the leading place in his class without difficulty, and seemed equally prominent in any department of the prescribed curriculum. He had a remarkable facility in the acquisition of languages. In later years, educated Germans did not detect any grammatical defects in his use of their tongue, and in written composition he was almost as much at home in German as in English. In college he exhibited the tendency to humor, and argument through good-natured irony and travesty, that followed him through life. No one thought of questioning his claim to the appointment of valedictorian, though there were able and promising young men among his classmates, notably the Right Reverend Ozi W. Whitaker, D.D., for many years Bishop of Pennsylvania.

The ten years that followed his college graduation may perhaps be described as years of self-culture. The period seems to have been one of intellectual ranging and grazing. It is true he was connected with educational institutions during those years, but his eager and restless mind would not be restricted to their demands. These ten years of Mead's life, when he was for the most part accountable to no one but himself, must have had a formative and decisive influence upon his entire intellectual labors. The variety of themes of which he has treated in his numerous publications discloses both a broad range of thought and a persistent pursuit of the topics receiving his attention. He by no means confined himself to those themes from which a salary was to come, nor did he stop work when his task was done. He arrived at definite conclusions,

entertained and expressed positive opinions, in natural science, ethics, and metaphysics. He translated some abstruse articles from the German, discussed the nature of time and of space, crossed swords with such men as Bowne, and the critics of the Pentateuch, and at Princeton stated his own personal views on theological doctrine and the infallibility of the Scriptures where Hodge and Green had spoken. In philosophy he was a realist, in epistemology he rested upon intuition, — allied with common sense.

As has been noticed, in 1865 the chair of Hebrew at Andover became vacant, and he was appointed to it. It was not the professorship that he would have chosen, but he accepted it. Before entering on his duties he was ordained in his native town, Cornwall. It was, at least in part, due to the friendship of distinguished men that so weighty a council was gathered in the little white meeting-house of that small community. In the council were two presidents of Middlebury College (one retiring from, one just entering, that office), a distinguished classical scholar and teacher from New York City, the most prominent theologian of New England, and two young pastors soon to be theological professors, one at Bangor and later at New Haven, the other at Oberlin.

A few weeks after his ordination he was inaugurated at Andover, where he remained fifteen academic years. He gave instruction in his department regularly during that period, except that he was allowed a year's absence (1871-72) for travel in the East, specially for visiting Palestine. Besides classroom work, preaching in the Chapel was no inconsiderable part of his service; and perhaps no one of his numerous gifts was greater than his gift as a preacher. He was seldom

more effective of good than when uttering the truths of the gospel in his own simple, consecutive, forceful, spiritual way. There was a good degree of prosperity during his occupancy of his professorship, the graduates of the year of his inauguration and of his retirement being the same in number — twenty-three. Some of the classes in the intervening years were large. There was a theological unrest in the Congregational churches while he was in the Seminary, but it did not amount to agitation till after he left the Institution.

The following remarks by Rev. Francis B. Denio, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature in Bangor Theological Seminary, will be read with interest:—

“The first sight I had of Professor Mead was at Middlebury College when he was present at the commencement of 1870. I was introduced to him as I was to be a future student of Andover Seminary. Six years later I began his acquaintance in the classroom. There I began the specific studies which have engaged the larger share of my attention during the past thirty years. The quality of his work, the temper of his mind, the tone of his thinking were a fitting example, and had great power over me as a student, and also over the earlier years of teaching when the example and influence of a guide means much to a young man in the opening of his professional career. The definiteness of statement resulting from the clearness of thinking and keenness of insight was a delight, and a stimulus to attempt similar modes of thought and utterance. The notebooks of his lectures came to be of much practical service by members of the class during the subsequent years in their active pastorates.

“A dry humor, a genial irony were easily near the surface in the classroom. Not infrequently the irony passed into the

reductio ad absurdum. This excited especial admiration. He was so adroit and so subtle that one was reminded of the story of the Eastern juggler who passed his sword through the neck of a man, leaving the head in place, and the man unconscious of what had occurred, until he was told to shake himself and then his head fell from his shoulders. Thus, sometimes the utterer of an absurd opinion did not realize how deftly his absurdity had been exposed. Such skilful rapier practice left the victim more admiring than resentful, for no bruises were left. I have often thought that I would gladly give a year of life to attain such skill in this mode of argument.

"My indebtedness to Professor Mead was not confined to the classroom. Probably because we were both Vermonters and graduates of Middlebury College, and certainly because of his cordial bearing, I found myself seeking him on all sorts of occasions, and I found him always helpful and in every way considerate.

"The current undergraduate rumor correctly regarded him as thoroughly conversant with German theology in its full breadth. For this reason also I went to him with many questions, the free discussion of which might have led the way to many embarrassments which I then little suspected. At a later time, when I came to know the real infelicities involved, I could not but admire the man for his freedom from embarrassment and also for his replies or discussions, which were such as to give no human being the right to take exception to what he did or said.

"Professor Mead was seen at his best when preaching in the Seminary Chapel. There, when his intellectual powers were fully seconded by all the moral earnestness of his nature, his hearers felt the white glow of zeal with which he expounded and enforced the obligations of the Christian life. A

sermon on Christian forgiveness stands out in the memory of the writer more vividly than any other heard in Andover. At about the same time I heard Dr. William Taylor preach on Agrippa's 'Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.' That sermon is fully matched in its permanent impression by the sermon of Professor Mead.

"My indebtedness is great to each member of the Andover Faculty of 1876-79. Each man had his own specific gift. Professor Mead's helpfulness was second to none during my student days. The abiding impression which has been with me during all these years is that he was more than teacher, more than preacher, excellent as he was in these capacities, he was a single-hearted Christian man. After all, this was the fundamental thing which led me to turn to him as friend and adviser through all the years that have intervened."

In 1882 Professor Mead resigned his chair at Andover. The Board of Trustees sent to him a letter of which the following is an extract:—

"The undersigned were instructed to communicate to you the regret which the Trustees feel at parting with one who in all his official relations, and in all social and private intercourse has been so uniformly faithful and true. The Trustees have learned to value your learning, your devotion to the Seminary, your personal generosity to the students, your public spirit in all matters of general concern, your charity and forbearance under peculiar trials which have again and again befallen the Seminary, and those graces of Christian character and piety which it does not become men to praise, but which men cannot fail to recognize and admire."

A few of the events of Mr. Mead's Andover life apart from professional work may with propriety receive brief notice.

What was known as the "Old South Controversy" moved his feelings very much, a few years after he went to Andover. He was in a position to know the conflict between the majority of the church members and the majority of the pew owners. The former desired to preserve the historic church edifice, the latter would have it demolished lest the name "Old South" should not be retained by the new building, in Dartmouth Street. Dr. Mead was indefatigable in his efforts to preserve the old structure. He procured a multitude of signers to a petition, and sent it to the Legislature when the question of the right to sell was pending. By extensive writing to neighboring ministers he secured a year's supply by individuals for the pulpit. He also wrote many articles for newspapers to arouse a public sentiment opposed to the destruction of the time-honored house of worship. And when, at the final crisis, Mr. George W. Simmons interposed to save the building, Professor Mead was one of the first to encourage him by telegraphing "Five hundred dollars from me. Go ahead. Others will respond." Nevertheless, it was sold at public auction, and in 1876 too, as old bricks, for \$1350. Finally, however, Mr. Simmons succeeded in his efforts; he bought the building, and it still stands on its old site, purchased subsequently. But George W. Simmons it was who saved the Old South Meeting-House.

In 1869 Dr. Mead became a member of the American Philological Association, organized that year. In 1870 he delivered the noted lecture on the "Uncertainties of Natural Science and of Religious Science" in the series of Boston Lectures on Christianity and Skepticism. He gave a second lecture the year following. In 1871-72 he, with his wife, spent sixteen months in travel in Europe and the East. The journey through Palestine was then a difficult one, made on horseback.

Mr. Mead examined places of interest with his characteristic thoroughness and accuracy. He saw that Stanley's interesting account of el-Mohrakah (place of Elijah's sacrifice) did not quite conform to the locality. He therefore made a second journey and ascent to the place, and prepared a description of it for the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* (vol. xxx.) which is still considered as the most accurate known to travelers or Bible students.

It was while Professor Mead was at Andover, just after his return to the United States, that he began work as a member of the American Committee on Bible Revision. He then entered on a task that lasted not only through his remaining years at Andover, but nearly through life. (This subject will be referred to again.) In 1881 Middlebury College conferred on him the degree of D.D.

After his resignation at Andover, Professor Mead returned to student life. The ten years which followed his professorship, like the ten which preceded it, were a period in which he was his own master. Again he ranged through authors and questions of philosophy and science at his own will. In September of 1882 he and Mrs. Mead went to Europe for a prolonged stay. After transient calls upon old friends, they settled for the winter at Bonn. Here he formed acquaintances with some well-known men, especially with Dr. Lange, Judge von Niebuhr, and Professor Christlieb. His time was given to close study, notwithstanding long walks with his new friends. In the spring of the following year he, with President Chapin of Beloit College, went, by appointment of the American Board of Foreign Missions, to Constantinople to aid in adjusting differences that had arisen between the Armenians and our missionaries at that place. The work of this Commission was considered to have produced a very happy effect.

The same year (1883) Mr. Mead attended the memorable celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Luther at Wittenberg. In June of the following year (1884) he went, with Professor George E. Day of Yale, to London, where, in the first week of July, they, as representatives of the American Committee, attended the session of the English Revisers, in the Jerusalem Chamber, at the completion of their joint work. After the visit to London, the remainder of the summer and several succeeding summers were spent in Switzerland. Both Professor Mead and his wife greatly enjoyed fine scenery, and specially frequented the Bernese Oberland. Dr. Mead sometimes said of Beatenberg, "This is the most beautiful place in the world!" It was there that he wrote the following lines:—

AT BEATENBERG.

WHILE ENVELOPED IN CLOUDS IN WHICH OCCASIONAL RIFTS DISCLOSED
THE SUMMIT OF THE JUNGFRAU.

"The mists that thick around me lie
Conceal from sight both earth and sky;
But now they break, and gleaming through
The Jungfrau's summit comes to view,
Bedimmed with haze and faintly seen,
Like Eastern dames whose covered mien
Peers through the gauzy veil, and shines
More fair because of softer lines.

"But now again the surging clouds
Come rolling by in denser crowds;
And mountain, lake, and Alpine green
Are hid behind the vapory screen;
Yet see! the screen is rent once more,
And still the Jungfrau, as before,
Looks downward from her lofty height
Unmoved, unchanged, majestic, bright.

“And so when mists of sin and doubt
Shut heavenly truths and beauties out,
Faith bursts the veil which hides above
The Lord of glory and of love;
Though dimly seen, and oft again
Concealed by clouds of care and pain,
Unmoved in his celestial height,
God sits in majesty and light.”

In the autumn of 1884 Professor Mead went to Berlin, his favorite German city, and returned there the two succeeding winters. Professor Isaac A. Dorner, his revered friend of former days, had died, but many old acquaintances were still living. He also formed valued new friendships, with the court-preachers Stöcker, Frommel, and others. In the winter of 1885-86, besides other work, he translated, in part, Dorner's "System of Christian Ethics," a posthumous work of the author which was published by his son, Dr. August Dorner. Dr. Mead's chief work on the volume related to the bibliography. He went to London in the spring and spent three months at the British Museum, enlarging the lists of books given by the author and editor; emending the titles and dates of publication of those already given; ascertaining which of the foreign works have been translated into English, and giving the titles of the translations; also adding a number of English and American works to the lists. The result is a valuable contribution to the bibliography of Ethics.

Still later he gathered up the results of prolonged study into a volume entitled, when published, "Supernatural Revelation." It was not published till parts of it had been delivered before the theological students of Princeton University. He gave at that Seminary the lectures on the Stone foundation, February, 1889. (This work will be referred to in another place.) In the spring of 1889 an informal proposal was made to him to become a Professor at Princeton. But, highly agreeable to

him as this in most respects appeared, he could not conscientiously assent to the Westminster Confession; and on his frankly stating his own views, they were found to differ too widely from those held at Princeton to make it wise for him to accept the position.

In 1891 Professor Mead, again in Europe, was a delegate to the Evangelical Alliance, holding its meeting that year in Florence, Italy. The same year he published a parody on some forms of Biblical criticism. It was composed in both German and English. In German it was entitled "*Der Römerbrief beurtheilt und geviertheilt*"; in English, "*Romans Dissected*." These were designed not, as has been sometimes assumed, to travesty The Higher Criticism, which, as he says (*Irenic Theology*, p. 249), is "an attempt to determine (so far as possible) the exact facts concerning the origin and composition of the Biblical Books," and "in this sense it should be welcomed and honored." But they were intended to show how higher criticism has been sometimes counterfeited by mere conjecture, and how plausible such conjectures can be made to appear.

In December, 1892, Dr. Mead returned to the United States, and for about five years was professor of Dogmatics in Hartford Theological Seminary. During this period he published a little book entitled "*Christ and Criticism*." He also delivered several addresses; as, one in Washington, in 1894, before the Church History Society, on Ritschl's Theology; in 1896, at Princeton, at the celebration of the jubilee of Professor William Henry Green, D.D., LL.D., his dear friend, and co-laborer in the revision of the Bible; at Rochester Theological Seminary, on Ritschl; and, in 1897, at Fairfax County Theological Seminary, Virginia. He was invited to the sesquicentennial of Princeton University, in 1896, where he received the honorary degree of D.D.; in 1898 he delivered an address

at the Mount Holyoke College anniversary. The same year he resigned his chair at Hartford, and gave his time almost wholly for the following six years to the American recension of the revised Bible. A large file of letters from his Hartford pupils came to him at this time, expressing their appreciation of his teaching and their regret at his resignation.

The following statements of his connection with Hartford Seminary, by a colleague in the faculty, will be of interest.

"Professor Charles M. Mead came to the chair of Christian Theology in Hartford Theological Seminary in 1893 with a well-deserved reputation for biblical and theological learning, won by contributions to these sciences which had obtained wide recognition on both sides of the Atlantic. He had just returned from a prolonged residence in Germany, and was able to bring to his classroom the latest discussions of the Fatherland as well as the ripe product of American scholarship. No better equipped scholar has ever occupied an American theological professorship. At Hartford Seminary for about five years he gave to the students of his utmost endeavor. Careful, conservative in the best sense, yet fully cognizant of current discussions, he initiated those under his charge into the deep things of Christian theology, and gave evidence to all of his essentially irenic temper and of his earnest Christian faith. The perplexities and difficulties of his students, to many of whom the questions of the classroom were new and baffling, aroused his most sympathetic interest, and enlisted his utmost endeavor to lead them to what he believed to be the eternal verities. Their personal struggles he made his own; and he gave himself to their aid in a large and helpful spirit. All who came in contact with him in these years of service were impressed with his learning, his candor, and his Christian consecration.

"The labors of the classroom did not prevent those of the study. During his service at Hartford, Professor Mead published a volume entitled 'Christ and Criticism,' besides many articles in learned periodicals, and his unremitting labor on the American revision of the translation of the Bible. His work reflected high credit on the institution of sacred learning with which he was connected.

"In his relations with his colleagues of the faculty Professor Mead was cordial, fraternal and helpful, showing himself ready to coöperate in all ways in his power, even at the cost of personal sacrifice, in all that had for its aim the advancement of the interests of the seminary.

"When Professor Mead laid down his professorship, in 1898, his going from the seminary was felt by his associates to be a distinct loss to the scholarship of the Institution, and the high respect in which they held him, as well as the estimate which they placed on his services, is witnessed by the representation of Hartford Theological Seminary at his funeral. Though associated with its teaching force for about five years only, Hartford Theological Seminary is honored to have numbered this American scholar among its instructors."

As the real burden of Bible Revision began to be felt by Professor Mead while he was still at Hartford and increasingly after his resignation, this is the place to call attention to that part of his service to the public. Taken up as an accessory for which his professorship fitted him, it proved to be the most distinguishing if not the most important labor of his life. He must have had it in hand fifteen years, and as an object of attention, at times of earnest and anxious attention, for fifteen more. When he was in England, Rev. Dr. Angus informed him of the then recent resolution to invite the coöp-

eration of American scholars with the English Committee in the work of Bible Revision, which had been begun in England in 1870. On his return to the United States, while employed at Andover in his office as professor, he was appointed a member of the Old Testament Revision Company, and began service in 1873. The Committee's work was not a slight one. The report of the revising process in the English Committees will give us some intimation of it. The preface of the edition of the Revised Bible published at Oxford in 1884 informs us that the work of that Committee was commenced June 30, 1870, and completed June 20, 1884; it occupied 792 days; that the greater part of the sessions were for ten days each, and each day the Company generally sat for six hours. The American Committee performed the same work as the English, but in such ways as circumstances required. They met ten times in the year, once each month except July and August, generally in New York City. The two Andover members took a night train for New York Wednesday evening, and returned as far as Boston on Saturday. The work of this Committee was not limited to their sessions, but they gave much time to preparation for their meetings. The English revisers, who initiated the work, had, as was fitting, the decisive vote on whatever changes were proposed, and the Americans pledged their support for fourteen years to the editions thus made. But it was proposed, on the English side, that in these editions the American preferences should, for the same period, be published as an Appendix. But this Appendix, for reasons given in the Prefaces of the American Bible, was exceedingly imperfect, and itself needed laborious revision. The British Committee disbanded, but the American Committee continued its organization with a view to a later edition of its own, and did not allow the fourteen-years

interval to pass without some partial preparation for such an issue. At length in 1897 systematic and organized work was begun for amending the Oxford edition by incorporating the American preferences. This threw a large amount of work upon Mr. Mead. He had entered upon this service before his resignation at Hartford in 1898. After his resignation it occupied his entire time. Between 1885 and 1897 many of the original Committee had died. Mr. Mead had been the youngest member of the Old Testament Company, and was obliged to take the largest share of the burden in this new work. Some of his colleagues said to him that Providence had raised him up to complete the undertaking. The members of the Old Testament Company were at this time so widely separated that with most of them the work had to be carried on by correspondence. Dr. Mead was appointed to go through the Old Testament and make his "Notes and Suggestions." These he had typewritten and sent to the other members, to be returned to him with their votes. He collated and recorded these votes. He took up his residence in New Haven, Connecticut, that he might be near Dr. George E. Day, who was Secretary of the Old Testament Company and also of the Joint Committee. Dr. Day's opinion and vote were highly important; but his vision was so greatly impaired by cataract that it was necessary for Dr. Mead to go over most of the ground with him orally. In addition to the work on the text of the Scriptures, in which the coöperation of all the members was required, Dr. Mead himself prepared the topical page-headings, a careful Appendix, the Preface, and a large part of the Scripture references, giving all prepared by others a careful review; he also revised the paragraph divisions given in the English edition. Finally, the reading of the proof rested on him. The proof-reading was very

exacting, and it greatly impaired his health for several years, affecting the nerves of his ears, and causing attacks of dizziness. He recovered from it later, however, and regained his usual health. His work on the Old Testament was regarded by the other members of both companies as necessarily far exceeding that of any other one member; and when in 1901, the American Bible (first edition) was issued, Professor J. Henry Thayer, Secretary of the New Testament Company, wrote to him: "We ought to be thankful that we have lived through it, especially YOU." On the second edition Dr. Mead spent again a great deal of time; and, in fact, to the end of his life, he was very often consulted by the publishers and their correspondents on a multitude of little points.

A leader in the house that put the work in type, writing to Mrs. Mead of this more recent work, said: "We are pleased to say that during the long connection we had with Dr. Mead, although sometimes we asked a great many questions which must have taken days of time to answer, we found him ever pleasant and ready to answer every question which was submitted to him in connection with the revision of the Bible. Such a labor of love as your late husband was permitted to render to the Christian public, not only of the United States but of the whole world, is an honor granted only to a few of the great scholars of the world."

Another member of the same house at an earlier period writes: "Dr. Mead was truly a great scholar, and during the years this work was in progress he freely gave his time and labor, without any remuneration whatever, to the making of what is conceded by scholars generally to be the most perfect translation of the Bible. In all this time under the trying delay incident to the completion of so great a task he was always patient and resourceful, ever looking upon the bright

side. The whole Bible-reading world is the gainer by his noble and generous life.

The following remarks upon Bible Revision were prepared by a college companion who had lifelong acquaintance with Professor Mead:—

“Dr. Mead’s work was confined to the Old Testament. He was unquestionably one of the very ablest Hebrew scholars on the Committee. Some of the original members had died and upon him fell far more than his share of the work remaining — particularly the Herculean task of reading the entire proof of the Old Testament as it came from the press of Nelson and Sons.

“The Revisers, British and American, had all along felt that the rare English of the King James Version must not suffer at their hands; that its purity, simplicity, beauty, vigor, and homelikeness — qualities that have made it so potent in molding the style of English authors since its appearance — must, at all hazards, be preserved. One is quite safe in saying that they have been; and that, in the American Edition especially, these virtues shine in even clearer light. Scholarship had grown profound and accurate in the intervening three hundred years. The Hebrew and Greek texts were better understood in 1901 than in 1611.

“In general, the changes made in the revision by the two Committees are retained in the American Edition, though in a number of instances the American Revisers have restored the renderings of the King James Version. But these Revisers, released from the old condition, went further in their effort to render the text more faithful to the original and simple to the common mind. They made complete, changes that were only partial. They eliminated all uncouth, obsolete and obscure locutions and unidiomatic constructions, modern-

ized the grammar, and brought the punctuation up to date; and this without marring the beautiful household diction of the old Version. There is good reason to believe that this Edition of 1901 will gradually supplant, in pulpit and popular use, on both sides of the Atlantic, all preceding Versions of the Bible, however excellent.

“No arithmetic can compute the debt the world will forever owe to Dr. Charles Marsh Mead for the wise, patient, and protracted service that finally devolved on him alone as member of the American Committee of Bible Revision.”

It is worthy of remark that all of the Revisers referred to have refused to receive any pecuniary compensation for their labor, or from the sale of books.

In 1900 Dr. Mead received a proposal to become Professor of Dogmatics at Montreal. This his Bible work did not allow him to accept. Again, in 1901, he was asked to lecture for the current year in the Congregational College of Canada on Dogmatics, but was compelled to decline because of the same pressing occupation.

In July, 1902, Dr. and Mrs. Mead again visited Europe, and were absent two years. Dr. Mead was then suffering much from deafness and dizziness, which physicians and aurists in this country and abroad agreed in ascribing to his overwork in proof-reading. The climate of London was unfavorable in the winter, and he crossed over to the Continent, stopping at Berlin, Mentone, North Italy, and Switzerland, spending the following winter at Mentone, the climate of which place he had found beneficial. The following summer he spent in Switzerland, and in August, 1904, he came back to this country. In the following years he spent the winters, at first in Boston, then in New Haven, the summers in Middlebury. In

October, 1905, he published his book entitled "Irenic Theology." In 1906 he attended the class gathering at the fiftieth anniversary of his college graduation, when his Alma Mater conferred on him the degree of LL.D.

In the last three or four years of his life Professor Mead seemed to have entirely recovered his health. His hearing was well-nigh perfect. As several of his friends said, he seemed to have taken a new lease of life. He seemed wholly well when he went to church on the morning of February 12, 1911. After the service he took a long walk with an old ministerial friend who was visiting New Haven. The midday was uncommonly warm for the season, and his return, after leaving his friend, lengthened his walk. He came home overheated and very tired. Precautions were taken to guard against a chill, but it became evident, after a day or so, that he was suffering from pneumonia. He was so much exhausted that he had no strength to throw off the disease. His pulse was rapid, and the strain upon his heart was great. On the forenoon of Wednesday he was thought by physician and nurse to be rallying. He said to his wife a little after noon, "Monday was my sickest day." About half an hour later, after a brief nap, in the twinkling of an eye as it were, acute dilatation of the heart took place, and he was gone. This at 2.30 P. M., February 15.

A few extracts from letters of sympathy to Mrs. Mead on the occasion of her husband's death will be of interest.

The President of the College wrote: "Only a very few of the graduates of Middlebury College have shed upon her greater lustre than did Dr. Mead. A great scholar, our most distinguished in the Old Testament field, he was also a great and noble man. His mastery in research never dimmed his evangelic fervor."

A prominent Trustee of the College wrote: "I deeply feel the loss of the greatest scholar Middlebury College has upon the rolls of her alumni. His life has been an inspiration to us — devoted always to the things of the spirit — master of the wisdom of the ages — his was a character whom the young shall be taught to venerate in the halls of his Alma Mater as long as she endures."

A younger friend wrote: "His interest in me and his great kindness made an impression on my boyhood that has endured until now. The love of God was in his face as truly as in his soul, and the thought of divine things expressed itself in his very smile. I am grateful that I should have had even the infrequent fellowship with this man of God."

An intimate college friend wrote: "In the best sense of the word he was a large man — large in native endowments, large in his acquisitions, large in his accomplishments, but in nothing larger than his heart."

One with whom there had been a cherished friendship from college days wrote: "We are no more to see that mild but firm countenance and that dome-like brow, more than once said to bear a remarkable resemblance to Shakespeare's, but we have before us the thoughts and words that have cheered and strengthened many. He was wise and witty, patriotic with a deep sense of justice, bold yet always self-controlled. His writings exhibit a style combining simplicity and strength to a remarkable degree. In general information on theological and philosophical subjects his opinions were of great value."

A friend of peace wrote: "His lofty patriotism and untiring efforts for the true welfare of America and of humanity, during the last dozen years, when the country has so sorely needed such a spirit and such service as his, are something which I shall never forget."

Another wrote: "The country, I may say the world, has suffered a great loss: from time to time I have read his articles with deep interest and profit. He was a teacher of the highest rank, both in the subjects he presented and in his thorough and clear way of treating them."

A highly-valued friend of fifty years' duration, at times in intimate association, writes of student days at Andover: "Among other accomplishments he was a fine singer, and our common interest in music drew us together. There was a quartette club of which we both were members. In these years a friendship was formed that continued unbroken until the end of his life. . . . When he retired and came to New Haven to reside in 1898, a very intimate association began anew. Almost daily we took our exercise together for several years. He impressed me in all our intercourse as a laborious student; an accomplished scholar; a thoughtful mind; a man of wide information, especially in Biblical Criticism and Historical Theology; of an earnest and devout spirit; a sincere and conscientious Christian. . . . He was exceedingly independent in his convictions and not easily shaken in them when once they were formed.

"No doubt his greatest service to his generation was his work upon the American Revision of the Old Testament. He was one of the latest survivors of the distinguished body of scholars to whom that work was committed, and very naturally the final stages of that work, its completion and preparation for the press, and its actual publication, fell into his hands. Upon this task he wrought with an industry that was immense, and that, for several years, seriously impaired his health. It was the toil of his days and his nights for a number of years, and the ripe result of the studies of his life. If, as has been said on both sides of the sea, this version is

the best English version ever yet made, I think we must give to him a large share of the credit. This is his best monument."

The following public expressions deserve record: "The New Haven Association of Congregational ministers has heard with deep regret of the death of Professor Charles M. Mead. Some of us have known him intimately, all of us have known of his honorable record as a man, a scholar and a teacher. We have known of his leadership in lifting the American Revision of the Old Testament so much above the English Revision on which it was based. We have felt the stimulus of his participation in our meetings, and remember with satisfaction the clear vision of truth and duty that inspired his utterances on social and political questions."

At the meeting of the Harvard Biblical Club held in Boston, October 14, the President, Dr. Toy, in the chair, the following notice was read by Professor Hincks: "The death on February 15, 1911, of Professor Charles Marsh Mead, one of the early members of this Club, leads us to put on record our high regard for his character, and our appreciation of the important service rendered by him to biblical knowledge, as Professor of Hebrew in Andover Seminary for sixteen years, as a member of the Old Testament Revision Company, and as a Commentator."

A notice of Professor Mead would be incomplete without some allusion to his characteristics as a man and a thinker. He did more than live and work: he left an impression behind him. We have ample means for understanding his cherished sentiments, especially his theological views. Besides numerous magazine articles in philosophy and theological criticism, he published two volumes of carefully written doctrinal

disquisitions. In 1889 he gave at Princeton University the six lectures on the L. P. Stone foundation, in which he treated of the Divine Existence and of Revelation. These lectures were embodied and published in a volume of 450 pages, entitled "Supernatural Revelation: An Essay Concerning the Basis of the Christian Faith." In 1905, after sixteen years of study and contemplation, he published a second volume of more than 350 pages, entitled "Irenic Theology: A Study of Some Antitheses in Religious Thought."

These two volumes present the most serious convictions of the author, and almost constitute a portraiture of his intellectual life. The Lectures bring to view the settled faith, on religious topics, of a man who had spent fifteen years in Bible teaching and seven years in review of his own thoughts and the thoughts of other men. "Irenic Theology" presents the views of which he had become persuaded after an intimate acquaintance with the struggles of progressive orthodoxy that had occurred at Andover, and after an extensive familiarity with English and German speculation. He was perfectly at home amid the teachings of Caird, Harnack, Ritschl, and other European authors.

The Princeton lectures treat of topics on which those entering the ministry should be well grounded. They were addressed specially to students, and related to the system of Christian doctrines, rather than points in dispute among advanced thinkers. The origin of theistic belief is the opening subject. This is followed by the grounds of theistic belief. As a preliminary topic the question arises, What is belief or knowledge? "Sure knowledge," he says, "is the product of the combination and comparison of individual cognitions." "All knowledge is thus seen to be a composite thing." Each one seems to have a direct perception of the

external world. He becomes confident of the accuracy and reality of his perception by learning that others have the same experience. The author bases the belief of the divine existence upon a tendency to believe in the supernatural; upon indications of an overruling power; and upon Christ's belief in God. "That God is a living reality is made certain to the Christian mind by the fact that God has manifested himself in Christ to the world."

The treatise of the doctrine of revelation is a thorough one; but the main interest, at the present time, is connected with the doctrine of miracles. Nearly one-fourth of the entire volume is devoted to this theme. This is not the place to discuss the topic itself; but recent discussions make it of interest to say, that he accepted the fact and evidential value of miracles, yet with some modification of the traditional orthodoxy. He says, "Miracles are to be defined as events produced by special extraordinary divine agency." Those ascribed to Christ must be regarded as real; and the general presumption that a special revelation must be authenticated by supernatural manifestations he considers valid. He admits, however, that we cannot deny one's right to question the accuracy of certain particular narratives of miracle. In any case, Christ's authority and headship did not depend on the miracles but upon his character.

He taught the doctrine of inspiration — not verbal inspiration in the sense that the words of the Bible record were dictated to the writers, but in this sense, that the thoughts imparted to them gave form to their expression. He taught, also, that the scripture narratives were not above criticism. They were written by fallible men, and discrepancies were to be expected. But he believed that criticism is limited in its range; it cannot eradicate man's tendency to believe, cannot

essentially change the canon of Scripture, cannot convince the world that there is any resort to pious frauds in the Bible.

The volume of 1905, "Irenic Theology," was written for the purpose of pouring oil on troubled waters. It does not aim to stifle debate, but to cherish toleration, and to foster the thought that, perhaps, there is something to be said on the other side. "The general purpose of the book is not to encourage an agnosticism which, because knowledge can not be made incontrovertible, despairs of all knowledge, but rather to show that theological knowledge, like knowledge in general, though partial, or even inaccurate, is yet an apprehension of real truth, and that the hope of progress in this apprehension lies, not in a spirit of intolerant exclusion but in one of tolerant inclusion." The author prepares the way for harmony in accepting variant views by pointing out certain discrepancies that must be admitted and passed over in the natural sciences. What is the nature of matter? Is it composed of atoms or is it a manifestation of energy? What is motion? Is it something that occurs in time? If so, it must occur in present time; but present time has no duration, and so affords no opportunity for motion. Theologians are not beset by any peculiar difficulties if they are compelled to admit that there are mysteries connected with their speculations which still await solution. He thinks, for instance, that all parties can agree on the origin of sin. It has two sources — innate depravity, and the free action of the moral agent. Some theologians give prominence to one source, some to the other. Every attempt to clear up the problem aids to an ascertainment of the truth. "It is only when each one in a one-sided way tries to exclude the other, that the failure to explain the difficulty becomes obvious."

The Professor held that other theological doctrines are to

be treated in like manner. Affirmations are to be maintained, denials cannot be supported. "We must maintain side by side with the Calvinistic doctrine of divine sovereignty the Arminian doctrine of human freedom." He believed that the adherents of Christian truth could harmonize their views on the agencies human and divine engaged in regeneration and sanctification; that they could come to an agreement on the deity of Christ and the incarnation.

This view he advocates after a thorough study of the history of these doctrines. He believes in salvation by Christ, in some sense by the death of Christ, but he rejects decidedly the schemes in New England called orthodox. He has no patience with vicariousness, substitution, sacrifice to justice, appeasing the wrath of God, paying the penalty due the guilty by the sufferings of the innocent. To him these sentiments are overstrained and absurd. "This theory of vicarious satisfaction therefore conflicts on every side with the enlightened moral instincts of men." He looks upon life in this world as a school rather than a court of justice: God orders affairs in kindness and seeks the salvation of men. "So far then as human analogies have any weight, they indicate that the more correct theory of the atonement is not the juridical or governmental, but (if I may so designate it) the paternal theory."

The literary character of Professor Mead has been brought to view sufficiently, perhaps, in preceding statements. He was not a voluminous writer, yet he did much with his pen. Four volumes of his own composition bear his name. He translated, from the German, Lange's Commentary on Exodus, and Dorner's Ethics partly; wrote also "Romans Dissected" and "Der Römerbrief," etc.; and some articles for encyclopædias. He wrote also more than thirty articles of criticism and philosophy — some original, some translated — published in various

forms, some in small bound volumes. Most of these were thrown off as occasion called for them — none of them hasty productions, but the expression of thought long cherished and often reconsidered. His thoughts were expressed in a clear style, fit words woven into sentences in the order suggested by the thought. It might be said he had no style; that is, he was not a stylist. His mind was not a prism that unfolded light into its composite colors, but was transparent, and the light emitted was pure and unalloyed. He had a mastery of language and found a simple expressive word for his thoughts, however subtle. His perfect knowledge of German never led him into its ponderous sentences. He never drew upon foreign languages to express his thoughts, as many reputable authors, for instance Matthew Arnold, have done. He was disgusted with pedantry, and protested against the use of *Zeitgeist* when English has *spirit of the times*. He was very loyal to the English tongue, and protested against coining new terms or giving strange meanings to old ones. The simplicity of his style, however, never hindered him from a powerful and an emphatic utterance of his convictions and impassioned feelings. He never claimed to be a poet, but he wrote many beautiful lines in verse — both original and translations.

Professor Mead was also an instructive and impressive *preacher*. While he was professor at Andover the pulpit of the Seminary Chapel was supplied by the five professors, each taking a term of Sundays for his portion of the work. Professor Mead's services elicited special attention, and many people came up the Hill from the village to hear him. The following is from the same hand that wrote concerning Bible revision:—

“ It has always seemed a marvel that Professor Mead could

preach as he did. He was a profound student of men and of books, but he wrote his sermons in the scholastic air of a theological seminary. He never had a pastorate though he mingled much with men. He found no subject-matter in, and gleaned no suggestions from, the daily trials and struggles and needs and aspirations of parishioners. He must have had, in the background of his mind, his own and his neighbors' life in the country parish of his birth, and he must have taken himself as representative of his fellows. What he felt and desired he thought they also must feel and desire. And so he met his hearers on a plane which was both theirs and his.

"The charm and the power of his sermons lay in the fact that *he* was in and through and behind what he said. There are those who preach simply from what they know intellectually. Between what they say and themselves there is a wide gulf of separation. The staple of their discourse is not the truth they have felt and have proved, and know by having lived it, but it is what they have seen or heard or found out by study. It was not so with Mr. Mead. His own strong but sweet and lovable nature pervaded his speech. The cogent argument, enforcing all others, was the quickening personality behind his utterance.

"Dr. Mead was a man easily aroused and enkindled, but he was not effervescent: he never preached sermons addressed primarily to the feelings. He strove to capture the intellect. He knew that only thus would those emotions be awakened that would lead to the permanent conquest of the will. He tried to convince the reason, get fast hold of the conscience, and so mold the life.

"It was a pleasure to see him in the pulpit, in his fugitive articles, and in his books, gather together all the shreds of evidence pertinent to his theme, twist them into strands, and

twine these deftly into cords that hold like the cables of ocean liners. And the verbal expression always matched and mated the thought. His German and Oriental studies had not vitiated his native tongue. Every word was apt—none other could be a fit substitute. No needed word was lacking, no needless word was used. And all, level to the apprehension of those addressed and carrying the thought on their surface, were marshalled in becoming order. Read his preface to the Old Testament of the American Revision if you would get an illustration of the simple, direct, lucid, trenchant, and forceful style of this master of English.”

Another friend of Professor Mead, competent to speak on this subject, who has gone through the whole range of political appointments from town representative to United States Senator, writes: “The profound scholarship of the late Professor Charles M. Mead was recognized by Biblical scholars at home and abroad. I think this reputation, high and deserved as it was, served to obscure and overshadow his extraordinary gifts as a preacher. In this field, had he chosen the pulpit, he could have easily excelled. The style of his discourse was simple, elegant, and crystalline in clearness. It was never sensational, yet strong, forceful; for it had the force of truth clearly conceived and clearly and beautifully uttered. These are the attributes of a great preacher, and Professor Mead had them to an extent I have rarely seen equalled. To these he added a winning and gracious personality. In a life not now short I have listened to much so-called pulpit oratory, some good, some otherwise. Without making comparisons I can affirm that Professor Mead met my idea of a great preacher.”

In church polity he was a decided Independent. He had no admiration of orders and rank in the clergy. He looked upon

ritualism as an empty, if not a vain, show. Religious virtues and powers he looked upon as individual possessions, bestowed directly by the Divine Lord of the church. He repeated more than once his ingenious and eloquent sermon on the text, "And there ran a young man and told Moses and said, Eldad and Medad do prophesy in the camp. And Moses said unto him. Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his spirit upon them."

As a member of the body politic, Mr. Mead had a deep interest in the welfare and policy of the country. It was the land of the fathers that he loved. He regretted the island additions to the country, and really abhorred what is known as "imperialism." The acquisition of the Philippine Islands he considered as an unspeakable mistake, would not now wait to place them in an improved condition, but thought that we ought to draw back at once, and "wash our hands of the whole thing." He desired that everything that might provoke international differences should be avoided, and wrote newspaper articles deprecating the fortification of the Panama Canal, earnestly arguing for its neutralization. In advocating this he spent the last weeks of his life. He suggested that the nations ought to enter into an agreement never to use aviation to aid in any way the conduct of military movements. He strongly disapproved of the increase of our navy. The cruise of the battle-ships he felt was not only a wicked waste of money, but was an example to other nations greatly to be deplored. He was an active member of the American Peace Society and of the Anti-Imperialist League.

His death was noticed by the League as follows: "The Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League, meeting in Boston, voted that the following resolution, signed by

Moorfield Storey, President, and Erving Winslow, Secretary, be placed upon the records of the Committee and communicated to the family of the late Professor Mead: Rev. Prof. Charles Marsh Mead, LL.D., D.D., who has successively represented the Anti-Imperialist League in Vermont and Connecticut, was its devoted friend and untiring advocate. The Executive Committee desires to record here and to express to his family and friends its appreciation of the service which our late Vice-President rendered in contributions to the press and publications of the League, inspired by a moral enthusiasm and conscientiousness which even those who were unable or unwilling to accept his arguments did not fail to recognize and respect. Professor Mead's loss is a great one to many causes and in many fields, but will be felt no more deeply than by the Anti-Imperialist League."

SOCIETIES AND CLUBS.

American Oriental Society,
Exegetical Society,
Biblical Club,
American Philological Association,
Victoria Institute,
Anti-Imperialist League,
Peace Society,
Elected member of the National Geographical Society just after his death.

PUBLICATIONS.

1863. Art. "Stoddard's Theological Lectures," *Bib. Sac.* **xx.** 734-751.
1865. Arts. "More Recent Works on the Life of Christ," *Bib. Sac.* **xxii.** 207-222; "George Calixtus" (translated from Henke), 315-343; "The Berlin University," 513-518.
1866. Art. "Professor Hermann Hupfeld" (translated from the German), *Bib. Sac.* **xxiii.** 673-679.
1867. Arts. "The Twofold Fundamental Law of Rhythm and Accentuation" (translated from Professor Hupfeld), *Bib. Sac.* **xxiv.** 1-40; "The Study of Monuments" (translated from Professor F. Piper), 276-296.

1870. Lect. "The Uncertainties of Natural and of Religious Science," Boston Lectures, pp. 103-144. Boston: Cong. S. S. and Pub. Soc.
1871. Lect. "The Primeval Revelation," Boston Lectures, pp. 47-85.
1873. Art. "El-Mohrakah, or the Place of Elijah's Sacrifice," Bib. Sac. xxx. 672-696.
1874. Art. "The Use of *لَا* with Negative Particles," Bib. Sac. xxxi. 487-506.
1875. Art. "Metaphysical Idea of Eternity," New Eng. xxxiv. 222-252.
1876. Trans. of Exodus, Lange's Com. ii. 1-179. New York: Scribner.
1879. The Soul Here and Hereafter. Boston: Cong. Pub. Soc.
1885. Art. "The Revised Old Testament," And. Rev. iii. 493-508.
1886. "Is Time a Reality? An Examination of Professor Bowne's Doctrine of Time," Bib. Sac. xliii. 601-631.
1887. Trans. (In part) of Dörner's System of Christian Ethics. New York: Scribner.
1889. Supernatural Revelation. New York: Randolph.
1890. Art. "Is Space a Reality? Observations on Professor Bowne's Doctrine of Space, Motion, and Change," Bib. Sac. xlvii. 415-444.
1891. Art. "Ritschl's Theology," Pres. Rev.
1891. Romans Dissected. By E. D. McRealsam (Pseudonym). New York: Randolph.
1891. Der Römerbrief. By Carl Hesedamm (Pseudonym). Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.
1891. Art. "Paulus und Seneca?" in Beweis des Glaubens.
1893. Art. "Paul and Seneca," Pres. Rev.
1893. Christ and Criticism. New York: Randolph.
1894. Inaugural Address, "Some Current Notions concerning Dogmatic Theology, Hartford Sem. Rec. iv. 185-205.
1895. Art. "Ritschl's Place in the History of Doctrine," Hartford Sem. Rec. v. 158-175.
1896. Address at Professor William Henry Green's Jubilee, May 5.
1896. Art. "The Gospel of Paul," Hartford Sem. Rec. vii. 9-27.
1897. Art. "Summons Back to Christ," Prot. Epis. Rev., April.
1897. Art. "The Fatherhood of God," Am. Jour. Theol. i. 557-600.
1898. Art. "The Age of Man as Indicated by the Natural Increase of Population," Bib. Sac. iv. 356-359.
1898. Address, "Personal Independence," at Mount Holyoke College.

1898. Art. "Phenomenalism in Philosophy and Theology," *Hartford Sem. Rec.* viii. 121-133.
1899. Art. "Tendencies of Recent Theistic Thought," *Hom. Rev.* xxxvii. 392-401.
1900. Review of George Trumbull Ladd's "Theory of Reality," *Bib. Sac.* lvii. 167-172.
1902. Art. "Intuitionist Criticism," *Am. Jour. Theol.* vi. 507-510.
1903. Review of Ladd's "Philosophy of Conduct," *Bib. Sac.* ix. 182-186.
1905. *Irenic Theology*. New York: Putnam.
1910. Review of Ladd's "Knowledge, Life, and Reality," *Bib. Sac.* lxvii. 166-169; art. "Paul on the Resurrection of Christ," 391-414.
1911. Various articles against fortifying the Panama Canal, and against the increase of the Navy, and in favor of Philippine Independence and Neutralization.

ARTICLE II.

CHRIST IN THE FOUR GOSPELS.

BY THE REVEREND EDWARD P. GARDNER, D.D.,

CHESTER, NEW JERSEY.

WE have four pictures of Christ in the Bible, — one given in each of the Gospels. They are essentially the same, for they represent the same glorious person, yet they are distinct from one another.

In the first chapter of Ezekiel, there is a vision that appears to the prophet, of four living creatures sent forth from the throne of God, — wonderful creatures, shining like fire and speeding swift as lightning on their course. They are a lion, an ox, a man, and an eagle. You see them again in the fifth chapter of the book of Revelation, and there they are represented as being in the midst of, and round, the throne of God. Clearly, these creatures correspond to the cherubim of the Jewish worship, and represent the fourfold energy of God as it issues forth toward the world. Accordingly they may be taken as symbols of the fourfold life of God revealed in Christ, and set forth in the four Gospels. Matthew gives us Christ as the lion; Mark, Christ as the ox; Luke, Christ as the man; John, Christ as the eagle. Matthew, Christ the lion, sets forth his power and majesty, the lion of the tribe of Judah; Mark, Christ the ox, his strength for labor, bending his neck beneath the yoke; Luke, Christ the man, his humanity as one with us in nature and experience; John, Christ the eagle, his divinity, soaring above the earth into the presence of God.

The closing verse of each Gospel gives the characteristic of

each. Matthew's last verse is, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." That is Christ the King. Mark's last verse is, "They went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." That is Christ the Worker. Luke says, "They . . . were continually in the Temple, praising and blessing God. That is the disciple's joy in Christ, their Friend. John says at the close of the twentieth chapter (which is the real end of the Gospel, for the twenty-first is an appendix), "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." That is Christ, the Divine One.

Matthew tells of Christ the King. The Jew, trained in the Old Testament, was expecting that the Christ would be a king. Prophecies of his kingly power run through all those Scriptures. God told Adam that "his seed should bruise the serpent's head." He made a covenant with Abraham "that his seed should possess the earth." Through Jacob, he said that "the scepter" should "not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh come." He covenanted with David, that his seed should sit upon his throne forever. Isaiah described a king who should reign in righteousness, and the subsequent prophets fill in the details of the kingly character. Suddenly the Old Testament ends with evident incompleteness, leaving every Jew looking for the promised Messiah.

We are then confronted with Matthew's Gospel. It was written by a Jew for the Jews. It has in mind Old Testament prophecies and Jewish expectations. Its object is to prove that the prophecies of the coming King are realized in Christ,

that he is indeed the very King whom the Jews were to expect. It says repeatedly, This was done that such and such a prophecy might be fulfilled. You find that or similar phrases more than forty times in this Gospel. They form its very warp and woof. You find it in Luke less than twenty times, and in Mark hardly more than once. This Gospel is written as the key to the Old Testament kingly prophecies. It comes in its right position in the Bible, just after the Old Testament, because it is linked closer to the Old Testament than is any other Gospel. It is the gate which opens from the one book to the other; the bridge by which you pass from the old economy to the new. It admits all that can be said of the regal grandeur of the promised Messiah, and then says, Look on this Jesus, and see if this grandeur is not manifest in him.

With this thought in mind, let us glance through the Gospel. The first verse is significant: a kind of key-text to the whole: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." But why call him especially the son of David, the son of Abraham? Because the two covenants of kingly power and world-wide rule were made to the seed of David and to the seed of Abraham, and it is Matthew's aim to show that Jesus is that seed. Look now at Matthew's genealogy. Luke also gives a genealogy, but note the difference between the two. Matthew's does not go farther back than Abraham, for he wishes to show Christ's connection only with the Jews. Luke's runs back to Adam, for he aims to show Christ's relation with the race. The two lines of descent are characteristic. Matthew gives the legal line, by which Christ was David's heir by Jewish law: Luke, the natural line, by which he was David's son in flesh and blood. In Matthew the incarnation is revealed to Joseph, Jesus' legal parent: in Luke, to Mary, his natural parent. In Luke the

glad tidings are sung to humble shepherds, types of the lowly classes the world over; in Matthew a star, itself an emblem of royalty, brings the wise men to worship at the feet of the King of the Jews. So from the beginning, you see characteristic differences.

You find them all the way through. When Christ comes to be baptized, Matthew tells of John's hesitancy in doing it, a touch revealing the King not found in Mark or Luke. After the temptation, we read only in Matthew, of angels ministering to him.

Turn to the Sermon on the Mount. You find many parts of that in Luke, but there it comes in incidentally. In Matthew it forms the King's inaugural message, and the promulgation of his laws. It occupies the same place here that the revelation of the law from Sinai did in the Old Testament. There Jehovah, having called out a people for himself and brought them forth from bondage, appeared to them on Mount Sinai, issued his laws for them, and unfolded the worship they should engage in and the kingdom they should have. Christ in Matthew is Jehovah once more on earth, repeating this Old Testament history. Here, having called out a people for himself, he ascends a mountain near Capernaum, makes himself known as a King of the new Israel, issues laws which are not an abrogation but a fulfilment of the Old Testament, and unfolds the worship and describes the kingdom set before this new people. As you read this manifesto, how can you help seeing another and a spiritual book of Exodus and Leviticus for another and a spiritual Israel, while the contrast, at the close, between the safety of those who hear and do his sayings and the ruin of those who hear but do them not, what is that but the blessings and the cursings of the book of Deuteronomy, when Moses says, See, I have set before you life and

death: choose life, that ye may live (Deut. xxx. 15, 19). When Jehovah spake the law from Sinai, the people trembled; so when this Jehovah had uttered his laws, the people were astonished, for he spake as one having authority. Such is the Sermon on the Mount.

The parables in the thirteenth chapter have a kingly character; they are a prophecy of the fortunes of Christ's kingdom. Christ's commission of the apostles in Mark and Luke occupies but a few verses; in Matthew it fills a chapter, for it is the King delegating his authority to his under-ministers. From now to the closing era of his life, occurs the movement towards Jerusalem. It is the King advancing toward his capital to take possession of his throne. It is a royal progress from the twentieth to the twenty-fifth chapter, and at every step he dilates in grandeur; he enters the city in triumph; he combats and overawes the Pharisees; he weeps over the city, and foretells its doom and the ending of the world, closing with the three parables descriptive of its final triumph and its overthrow of opposition, — the wise and foolish virgins, the servants with their talents, and that last perhaps sublimest picture in the Gospels, where Christ shows himself as the sublimest figure, Christ the King in glory and the angels round him, while he awards to all mankind their everlasting portion. Surely the grandest prophecies of the Old Testament are more than fulfilled here.

At last Christ bows his royal head in death, but through all these shameful scenes he moves as king. It is Matthew, and he only, who tells of the legions of angels who are ready to do his bidding; of the dream of Pilate's wife; of the earth rending at Christ's death, and the saints coming from their graves to form his retinue as he ascended; of the angel, with countenance like lightning, who rolled back the stone from the

tomb, and before whom the keepers became as dead men. Matthew records but two scenes in Christ's resurrection life, but in both he appears as king. In one he is worshiped, in the other he declares, "All power is given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, . . . whatsoever I have commanded you." We have no hint in Matthew of the ascension. It is a remarkable omission, yet it is to be explained by remembering Matthew's object. He wishes to keep before our thought Christ as king of this world; and therefore the last view he gives of him is not ascending into heaven but ruling over earth. So ends Matthew's description; it is all Christ as King.

Mark shows us Christ as Worker. In Matthew we had royal power, in Mark we have constant action. There Christ wore royal robes and called for homage. Here royalty is laid aside, and but one thought controls him, — how to use every moment and put forth every power to do man service.

An ox is an emblem that we shrink from using in regard to Christ. Yet if we think of oxen at the plow, every muscle tense with effort, the heads bent, the strong shoulders under the yoke, subduing acre after acre by their indomitable strength; and if we remember that in Ezekiel's vision, the ox was winged, and rushed as swift as lightning on its course, and that it probably refers to the winged oxen sculptured on the walls of Nineveh, — it becomes no unfit emblem of the strong, resistless energy of Christ.

It is generally believed that Mark wrote his Gospel for the Romans. There are Roman words in it, and references to Roman customs, and explanations of Jewish peculiarities which none but a Roman would require. It is probable that, laboring among Romans, he was led to show them that there was that in Christ which was adapted to them, that the very

energy of which they boasted and in which they stood supreme among mankind, had its highest manifestation in Christ. He was "the noblest Roman of them all."

See how many things combine to give the impression of Christ as the Worker.

Notice the omissions of this Gospel. If a man claim to be a king, you need to know his ancestry, for his claims are based on that. But if he is to be your servant, you do not care for this; you wish to know what he can do, and the sooner he begins to work, the better. Therefore, while Matthew, telling of Christ as king, gives his genealogy, Mark omits it all. Indeed, he tells us nothing of Christ's antecedents. There is no reference to the angels' song, or the wise men's visit; not an incident of the nativity; we are not even told that Mary was his mother or that Bethlehem was his birthplace. There simply come eight swift verses describing John who was his forerunner; one more tells of his baptism; two of the descent on him of the Spirit; two more of the temptation; and by the thirteenth verse of the first chapter, he has entered on his work. Three and a half chapters in Matthew, and as many more in Luke, are condensed, in Mark, into thirteen verses. There are numerous other similar omissions. Mark leaves out nearly all the discourses, for he is telling of the worker, not the teacher. He condenses the commission of the apostles, which in Matthew occupies a chapter, into three or four verses. He omits the curses pronounced on the scribes and Pharisees. He records only four parables, while Matthew has fifteen, and Luke twenty-one. Then he never calls Christ "Lord" till after the resurrection. Even in conversation, when, according to the other evangelists, Christ is addressed by this title, Mark, as of set purpose, omits it everywhere but once (and that might have been an

interpolation), as if feeling that it would mar the impression that he wishes to make. Matthew has many references to the prophecies: Mark, after the first three verses, has but one. Matthew speaks often of the law: the very word "law" is not found in Mark.

Now look at what Mark does record. This is far the briefest of the Gospels, yet it tells of nearly as many miracles as do any of the others. And they are told in an intense and vivid way; you can fairly see Christ working them. You catch his tone, his look, his gesture; you hear his very words. Mark uses the present tense of the verb in narrating them, as if they were occurring even while he told them. He tells of the circumstances, the astonishment of the multitudes, the awe of the disciples. Matthew, for example, says, when Christ was baptized, "The heavens were opened"; Mark, according to the Greek, says, They were "rent asunder." Matthew says Christ rebuked the wind and the waves on the Sea of Galilee; Mark gives the words of the rebuke (you can hear them ring across the angry billows), "Peace, be still." Matthew gives the record of the healing of the man sick with palsy: it is brief and general. Mark gives every incident — the eager crowds about the door, the four men carrying the paralytic, the uncovering and breaking through the roof. Compare the two accounts of the Gadarene demoniac. In Matthew, the act is subordinate to the person who works it: in Mark, the act is everything, and he brings it out with such vivid and dramatic force that you seem to stand upon the spot and witness it.

Then Mark makes you feel, as do none of the other evangelists, the pressure of the ever-present crowds, and the whirl of excitement amid which Christ moved. He says the people thronged him continually; that his fame spread wider, the

more he sought to conceal it; that whole villages and towns and districts were roused by his presence; that the sick sought to touch the mere hem of his garment.

He describes the swiftness of his work. There is not one languid moment. One deed treads on the footsteps of another. See how frequently in the first three chapters you find Mark's favorite words "immediately," "straightway," "forthwith," which are the same word in the original. In the first chapter only, you have "straightway coming up out of the water," "immediately the Spirit driveth him," "straightway they forsook their nets," "straightway he called them," and so on, the word used ten times in this one chapter. What a sense of breathlessness is here! The narrative fairly seems to pant in its efforts to keep up with the swift successiveness of the deeds of power and mercy.

It is Mark who twice records that he "had no leisure so much as to eat"; that his friends sought "to lay hold on him, for they said, He is beside himself." The other evangelists tell us much of Christ's suffering, his sorrow, and weariness. In Mark there is hardly a hint of this. You would scarcely know that his work cost him anything. You may well believe it indeed. Such constant teaching, so many miracles, the perpetual presence of the sick and those possessed with devils, must have drawn upon his vital power, and worn down brain and heart and limbs, but he never hints at it himself. Doubtless he tells it to the Father, but the world knows nothing of it. Not until, for the accomplishment of his mission, he needs to speak of it; not until the Worker prepares to cease his work and begins to suffer, and Gethsemane and the cross are nigh at hand, does he give evidence of his trials. He is like a soldier in the thick of battle, who hides his wounds and stays the blood that he may fight on.

Such is the picture that Mark gives, one utterly absorbed in loving work for men. I know no other biography that gives you such a sense of consecration and intensity. Lives of reformers, heroes, martyrs, seem languid and inert beside it. His ministry lasted hardly three brief years, but into them he compressed the energies of well-nigh a century. No life was ever so crowded with activity as his. Christ the Worker is as far beyond mere human comparisons as is Christ the Sufferer.

Now we come to Luke, who tells of Christ the loving Friend. Here we learn how human Christ was, how wide in sympathy, how quick and deep in pity and in love.

Luke begins, and he is the only one who does, by telling us of Christ's infancy and youth. We have here the joy of Mary when she was told she was to be his mother, and Elisabeth's sympathetic delight. We are told how he was wrapped in swaddling clothes and laid in the manger, circumcised on the eighth day, and presented in the temple. We have an account of his childhood, and a glimpse of his boyhood when, at the age of twelve, he went up to Jerusalem and astonished the doctors by his understanding and his answers. We learn that through successive years "he increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." Who can compare this with the opening of the other Gospels, and not see that Luke is preparing to give us a deeper insight into Christ's human nature than the others? We feel that we know a man better if we have been acquainted with him as a child, and we feel that we shall better understand Christ's manhood for these glimpses into his childhood's life.

Now glance along the Gospel, and see how his humanity is dwelt on. Here we learn how he rejoiced in spirit when the gospel was revealed to babes; how he wept as he journeyed

to Jerusalem; that in Gethsemane he sweat as it were great drops of blood, and an angel came to strengthen him. Luke alone tells us that Christ turned and looked on Peter in the judgment hall, the reproachful look that showed the wounded heart; that with his latest breath he cried, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit"; that after the resurrection he ate with the disciples to prove his resurrection body, and made the hearts of the two burn within them as he walked with them to Emmaus.

Luke dwells more than any other on Christ's prayers. He alone tells us that Christ prayed when he was baptized and when he was transfigured; that he prayed all night before he chose the twelve apostles; that he prayed for Peter, that his faith fail not, and for those who crucified him. He tells how he taught others to pray both by precept and example, giving, as illustrations, the man going for bread to his friend at midnight, the widow pleading with the unjust judge, and the contrast between the Pharisee and the Publican.

Think too of the character of the parables Luke records. There are a number given both by him and Matthew, but even in those there are characteristic differences. The same parable has more majesty in Matthew and more tenderness in Luke. In Matthew the feast to which the gospel is compared, is given by a king to his subjects; in Luke it is given by a friend to his neighbors; while in those that are peculiar to each, the differences are striking. Compare the three in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew and the three in the fifteenth of Luke. These are perhaps the most striking parables in either Gospel, and how clearly does each show the evangelist's intention. In Matthew the three are the wise and foolish virgins, the servants with the talents, and the nations at the king's right hand and left: they speak of our responsibility to a sovereign in

whose hands is our eternal destiny. But in Luke the clustered characteristic three are the shepherd searching for his sheep, the woman for her coin, and that tenderest of parables, the prodigal son. There is nothing here of the awful sovereign, but the compassionate Redeemer loving, seeking, finding, lost humanity.

Luke shows Christ's sympathy for special classes. This is the children's gospel, for his tenderness to children is specially displayed. It is woman's gospel, for his affectionate regard for her is strikingly manifested. Think of the accounts of Mary and Anna and Elisabeth, the women who ministered to him, the one who washed his feet with her tears, the widow at Nain, Mary and Martha at Bethany, and the daughters of Jerusalem who bewailed him as he went to Calvary. It is the gospel for the poor, for Christ's own poverty is dwelt on, while all through occur incidental but noteworthy tokens of his sympathy for them. It is the outcast's gospel, for here you have Christ's friendship for the publican, the Samaritan, and the harlot. Modern Christendom has learned its lesson of compassion from this Gospel, shown in the erection of asylums and reformatories.

It shows peculiarly Christ's feeling toward sin and his efforts for man's rescue. In none of the other Gospels do we see so fully the pollution of the human heart, and Christ's patience and his power to save. More frequently than in any other Gospel does Christ call men sinners, and he himself is called the Saviour and his work salvation. His love is no weak sentimentalism ignoring the evil in the characters of those he loved; while he pities, he condemns, and he sees that only as they are rescued from the sin itself can there be any real salvation.

This Gospel lets us see what suffering Christ's sympathy
Vol. LXIX. No. 274. 4

cost him. Mark hides the sufferings that we may think upon the work; Luke shows the sufferings that we may know what the work cost him, and so appreciate the greatness of his sacrificing love.

Such is Christ in Luke. We here have come in contact with Christ's heart, and it is the noblest, tenderest heart that ever beat; of broadest sympathies, of truest love, of supremest sacrifice. All that men call heroism is in it, unquailing courage, resolved and purposed consecration; but there is also the supremest tenderness, the largest charity, the keenest sense of other's woes. The loftiest qualities of manhood, the gentlest traits of womanhood, are blent in him. His heart is an open port from all life's storms. If we would know Christ's power we look to Matthew; if we would be stirred to work we turn to Mark; but if ever burdens grow heavy and human sympathy is withheld we turn for solace to that revelation of the human heart of Christ in Luke. Read that Gospel, and you understand how we have a friend that sticketh closer than a brother, a high priest who is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, for he "was in all points tempted like as we are."

From Christ the Son of man, in Luke, we turn to Christ the Son of God, in John. John was well fitted to give this picture. More perhaps than any other of the apostles, he adored the Lord. He seemed to forget himself in thinking of Christ. He never called himself by name in this Gospel, but designated himself as "the one who lay on Jesus' bosom," "the disciple whom Jesus loved." After ages have called him "John the Divine." He wrote the Epistle which begins, "Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ," and the keynote of which is, "God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him."

He wrote this Gospel in his old age, fifty years, perhaps,

after Jesus had passed away, but the intervening years had not dimmed the vision of Christ; rather had constant meditation made Christ grow more real and wonderful.

In speaking of this Gospel, we notice, first, that John points directly to the person and the character of Christ, and dwells on his words and acts only as they set him forth. The whole Gospel seems to stand in the attitude of John the Baptist, and to say, "Behold the Lamb of God." The first miracle is spoken of as manifesting forth his glory. His first disciples were won, not by what he said or did, but by dwelling in his presence. They said, "We have seen the Messiah." That thought is everywhere. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" His discourses are chiefly revelations of himself. He does not give precepts, or speak of the kingdom, or of his coming again; it is himself, in glorious, present reality, whom he reveals. He constantly utters phrases such as these, "I am the way, the truth, and the life"; "I that speak unto thee am he." The personal pronoun "I" which in all the other Gospels he employs but thirty times, here he uses nearly one hundred and thirty times; and the phrase "I am," used in the others nine times, occurs here forty-five times.

Then, Christ is set forth as the revelation of God. This is indicated by John's method of beginning his Gospel. While Matthew gives Christ's genealogy as king of the Jews, and Luke as son of Adam, John describes him as coming from God. We have no word of his earthly antecedents; simply that before his appearance on earth he had dwelt eternally in heaven. The title given to him at the beginning of the Gospel, "Word of God," implies this. A word is that by which

you express your thought. Often in our words we utter merely some transient or surface thought. But what if at some mighty moment of our life, when our being was astir to its foundations, we could utter some word or sentence which was a revelation of what was deepest in us, our innermost convictions, our holiest and most controlling purpose; if our inner self should there find utterance? Such was Christ to God, God's supreme word, his message and his self-revelation, the central, final, utterance of himself to sinful, ruined, yet redeemable man. You frequently find expressions such as these: "I and the Father are one"; "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father"; "The only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

It is this which gives a sense as of heaven to all Christ says. There is no account of the Transfiguration or the Ascension, for none is needed. There is no need of the Transfiguration, for the divine glory constantly shines through and transfigures him; nor of the Ascension, for he continually dwells in heaven. Even his sufferings hardly seem to touch him. Only on one brief occasion does he speak of his anticipation of the cross; and even when the end draws near, he refers to it only to comfort his disciples. In Gethsemane we are told nothing of his agony or prayer, simply of his self-possession when he meets his murderers. All through those scenes he lives as in a realm where trouble cannot come. He is the Son of man who is evermore in heaven.

This revelation of God in Christ is set forth as meeting our soul's deepest needs. There is little said here of our earthly requirements. You find more commands in Matthew, more inspiration to work in Mark, more human sympathy in Luke; but for our deepest need, for fellowship with God, we come to Christ in John. Christ describes himself in ways like

these: "I am the bread of life"; "I am the living water"; "I am the light of the world"; "I am the door," "the shepherd," "the vine," "the resurrection and the life." His miracles are self-manifestations. The word used for them is not *dunamis* (power), but *semeia* (signs) — tokens, that is, of what he is. When he turns the water into wine, or gives the blind man sight, or heals the impotent, or feeds five thousand, or raises Lazarus, it is always to body forth the spiritual miracle he will work when he gives to them himself; and ordinarily he follows the miracle by such an explanation.

The manner in which Christ and his salvation becomes ours is represented in the clearest light, far more so than in the other Gospels. That familiar verse in the third chapter expresses it, beginning, "God so loved the world." Six of John's favorite words are in this verse — love, gave, world, believe, hath, life. Christ is God's gift to men. He is also the giving of God himself; for God was in Christ, and all the treasures of the Godhead are bestowed on men when Christ is given them. This salvation becomes ours simply by receiving it. Figures which Christ himself uses indicate this. What do we do with bread, with water, with life, but receive them into ourselves? "Believe" is one of John's favorite words. You find it three times as often in this Gospel as in the other three together. There is a slightly different meaning to it in John from what it has in Paul's Epistles; with Paul, faith is resting on a promise; with John, it is recognizing a reality. Indeed, the difference between Paul and John runs everywhere. Paul looks at sin on the ethical side, as breaking God's law and requiring to be punished: John sees it in its essence as shutting God out of the heart, and so being its own punishment. Salvation, according to Paul, is reconciliation with God; to John, it is the indwelling of God. God's gift, according to Paul, is

righteousness; according to John, it is life. The one emphasizes obedience; the other, fellowship. One is practical and executive; the other, mystic and interior. Paul is the man of intellect; John, of intuition. Paul reasons; John sees. Paul builds truths into a system; John's sentences shine forth as separate stars in the firmament of truth. Salvation, in John's Gospel, is God's communication of himself to the receptive soul. Forgiveness, reconciliation, is only the beginning, the doorway, by which all of God becomes ours. The three great words which describe God, and show that he meets the needs of man, are, light, life, love. God is life, eternal, underived. Salvation consists in this life flowing into man's dead soul. God is light, which means holiness, knowledge, joy; to be saved is to have this light shine into our dark hearts. God is love, which in its very essence is self-communication and self-sacrifice, which pours itself into hearts whose sin and ruin was that they were self-centered, and therefore isolated, and which by its incoming merges them once more in the harmonious universe of God.

This salvation, therefore, is a present reality. "He that believeth hath everlasting life." John speaks little about heaven or about Christ's second coming; his teaching centers on what Christ is now. Salvation, with John, is not going into heaven; it is heaven coming into us. You have it taught in those wonderful chapters from the thirteenth to the seventeenth. Before this, Christ had been offering himself to the world; now, he is alone with his disciples. Read those chapters, and you see what communion with Christ is, and what the present blessings are which Christ bestows. He is not here as a king declaring laws; or human friend, offering affection. He is the Divine One pouring heavenly life into man's soul, the crystal river from the throne of God, coming into the channels of

earthly consciousness. It is peace, joy, rest. "These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full." "Peace I leave with you; my peace I give unto you." "Abide in me, and I in you." Then in their presence he prays for them, showing the twofold relationship in which he will stand to them henceforth, — interceding for them with the Father, and pouring the Spirit into their souls. It is the experience of heaven. And this is given that we may understand the blessedness the soul may have when it accepts Christ. Thus, this is the gospel of the risen life; the life of the soul in conscious fellowship with God.

Each Gospel meets our needs. It was divinely ordered that we should have four biographies of Christ, that each aspect of his life in its separateness might stand before us. Compassed by the rebellion of the world, Matthew tells of the King, before whom one day all rebellion is to yield. To kindle us to toil, we have Christ in Mark, the tireless worker. When troubles press and we long for consolation, we have the friend that sticketh closer than a brother, Christ in Luke. Yet we need something beyond all these. These are earthly aspects of our life. We are of God, born of him, made for him. Darkness and emptiness of heart are ours, because he is shut away from us. Therefore Christ in John comes to us. He is God made flesh, the life of heaven let down to earth. He speaks of purity and peace and love; he bids us open our hearts and let him enter. We do so; and, as he enters, our agitation passes away, our fears are hushed, our needs are met; a life of love and joy and worship, the life of Christ, the life of heaven, begins.

This view of Christ in John is to be our eternal portion. The time is coming when we shall not need to be told of Christ the King, for there will be no rebellion; shall need no

kindling to work, for work will be delight; shall require no sympathy, for burdens will be things of the past; but forevermore, Christ as the revealer and communicator of God will shine upon us, and we shall be lost in worship.

The Gospels bring us by successive stages into ever-growing knowledge of Christ. It is as if we should meet some great and kingly person, and at our first interview with him, be impressed by his stately bearing and evident consciousness of power. That is Christ in Matthew. Presently we know him better, and find him using his power in constant acts of service. That is Christ in Mark. Grown more familiar with him, we are admitted into his family and to the unreserve of the home circle. Then we see what a rare, unselfish, kindly heart beats under the royal vestments and kindles the active life. That is Christ in Luke. More intimate with him yet, we are present with him in those high and sacred moments when his inner self lies bare and he holds fellowship with the Father, when what is temporary and superficial is laid aside and the life that came from God and goes back to God is revealed. That is Christ in John.

The Gospels separate into couplets in which one is the complement of the other: Matthew gives us sovereignty, and Mark, service; Luke, the revelation of ideal humanity, and John, the revelation of God.

This fourfold Christ stands foursquare to all the race. As the New Jerusalem in John's vision was foursquare, with gates on every side, and, approach it from what side you would, there was an open entrance straight before you; so this fourfold Christ confronts humanity. He faces alike all quarters of the globe,—east, west, north, south. Men may approach him from every race and clime, from diverse ages and states of civilization; yet before each man stands this

Christ, and an open doorway meets him, leading straight into the Redeemer's heart. He is the Christ for all the world.

This Christ is the evidence of his own reality. He is too wonderful to have been fabricated by men's imagination. "It takes a Jesus to forge a Jesus." As well think the bushmen of South Africa, dwelling in their huts of bark and branches, could have drawn the plans for Saint Peter's, as that these low-thoughted, Galilean peasants, with their experience of stunted humanity, could have conceived this Christ. He must have existed or they could not have drawn him. Admit, if you will, minor historical inaccuracies, still this stupendous Jesus, outreaching all humanity, must have stood before them; what they painted, they must, in substance, have actually seen.

This Christ proves Christianity. Such a being could not have appeared in the world but for a worthy object. Men do not build cathedrals simply to camp in for a summer's outing, nor construct a reservoir in the mountains that boys may dip into it their tin cups. Christianity must be the world's supreme religion, because Christ is history's supreme person.

Nay, more, Christ is Christianity. We may have our separate philosophies and theologies, and our life and conduct may vary with our individuality and circumstances. But, for all of us, to trust, to love, to worship Christ; to take him as master and guide, the inspirer of our actions, the rest of our souls; to have fellowship with him, the joy of earth, and seeing him face to face, the glory of heaven, — this is the heart and center of the Christian life.

ARTICLE III.

THE DIVORCE PROBLEM: A RATIONAL
RELIGIOUS VIEW.¹

BY THE REVEREND CHARLES CAVERNO, LL.D., LOMBARD, ILLINOIS.

DIVORCE is a comprehensive topic — includes much upon which comment is needed. But the space at command will suffer little more than hints and outlines. Method is needed more than matter. I had better express an opinion in the case, or on some prominent points in it, rather than to elaborate an argument and cite references. It ought not to savor of egotism for me to set forth the conclusions and convictions at which I have arrived, if I say that I wish no more force to be given to my opinions than there is force in the reason of them, express or implied.

SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE.

Lest we get swamped in particulars in the discussion, I wish to bring forward at once its final conclusion, and it is this, that the supreme wisdom covering the whole matter is in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel according to Matthew. That wisdom is defensible before an a priori rationalism or an a posteriori pragmatism. It is defensible speculatively and practically. Anything else written or spoken by man may be set aside or lost and we shall have all we need for the guidance of the human race in the words of Jesus Christ as set forth in that chapter. I have no criticisms of that

¹ An address delivered before the students of Chicago Theological Seminary.

chapter either as to Greek text or translation. I take it as it appears in the accredited texts and in any of our commonly known translations or in the versions of any tongue. All these sources of information agree, and convey ideas easily and commonly understood in all their particulars.

The Scripture doctrine of divorce is very simple. After Christ's handling of the law of Moses on divorce, nothing remained of it unless you except what is covered by Christ's permission of divorce in case of adultery.

No other author in the New Testament treated of divorce *a vinculo*, i.e. divorce from the bond of matrimony with permission of marriage to another party. The better scholarship holds that Paul did not treat of such divorce at all; in fact, that Paul neither authorized nor encouraged any sort of divorce whatever.

Now I shall be told, "You give the traditional view." To which I reply, "Suppose I do give that view, what of it?" What if, after examination had, I conclude that the traditional view is correct? It ought not to detract from the force of my opinion that some one else agrees with me; in fact, that there has been a consensus of judgment through the centuries, and that it has constituted the history of the Christian church from the earliest times. Is one's opinion to be valued just because he disagrees with somebody or everybody else? The traditional view should have value because it is Christ's view, because it has made history, and because it is wholesome for mankind. What is held in the church "*semper, ubique et ab omnibus*," is entitled to respect, especially if it has been held in the face of a gainsaying and practising world. At law, precedent is not set aside just because it is precedent. One adds strength to the case he seeks to make, by showing its consistency with preceding rulings.

Some ways of making void the historic and the common understanding of Jesus' treatment of divorce need examination. It is said that Jesus spoke of a "private putting away," and not at all of statutory or judicial divorce, such as legislators and courts may decree. It is said that Jesus was not a legislator, and that he only set out principles for the regulation of the conduct of individuals. It may be asked on orthodox grounds, Why this extreme caution to keep Jesus out of the ranks of legislators? God is a lawgiver, is he not? If Christ is his accredited representative, why might not he be a lawgiver too? If anything is apparent on the face of the Gospels, it is that Christ marched hither and yon through Jewish custom and statutory law, knocking the underpinning out beneath them, no matter what tumbled. There are no less than six cases in the Sermon on the Mount in which Jesus declared Jewish law void — three of these cases standing in custom, or common law, and three in statute. Wrong stood no better with him because it was in law than in individual life. Custom makes common law. The days were few in which he did not set aside law.

In fact, just the matter that Jesus passed on in this nineteenth chapter was what arose or might arise under a statute. Just what the Jews pleaded was a statute, and just what Jesus said was that a statute could not cover up divorce — not even a statute of Moses — that there was a higher law behind him under which his legislation was abrogated. It is true that Jesus, "like Cæsar with a Senate at his heels," did not organize a legislature to repeal or enact laws, and that he did not set up a supreme court to pass on their validity. But what difference does it make whether Jesus repealed a law in form or said there should be no practice under it? In the latter case the law is just as dead as in the former. The latter he did do.

The Pharisees and the disciples so understood it, and it has been so understood by the Christian church through the ages. Saving one exception, hereafter to be noticed, Jesus cut up divorce, root and branch.

He *acted* very much like a legislator and a judge — if not for secular society, at least for his church. He laid down rules of practice for his followers that left human law without function. It is in vain to thrust in a legislature or a court between Jesus and the indissolubility of marriage. He said what God joined together in marriage *man* should not put asunder — not even if he pleaded a statute as sacred as a law of Moses to a Jew.

Another way of turning the force of the plain intent of this chapter is to claim that Jesus is not to be taken literally — that he was idealizing — that he meant to say if one found himself in a pleasant marriage relation, one which had in it evidence of the Divine approbation, he should not seek to break it up. The first thing that should be said is, that if Jesus wanted to speak thus he could have so spoken, but he did not. The next thing that may be said is, that this theory is not old enough to go alone. It is a birth of the last century, is a plain attempt at justification of the freedom of divorce which grew up in that century. It has no standing in history. It can show no support from apostle, father, or commentator of repute.

The fundamental misconception of modern thought on the matter at issue is this, sentiment in regard to marriage is made to obscure the foundation of the family on sex. That there ought to be sentiment in, and in regard to, marriage is greatly true. But one other thing is true, and that is that Jesus closed out the whole discussion about divorce without a reference to sentiment. Let us refer to Matt. xix. 4, 5, 6 (A. V.) :—

"And he answered, and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female?

"And said, For *this cause* shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and *they twain* shall be *one* flesh.

"Therefore they are no more *twain*, but *one* flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not *man* put asunder."

The whole matter was settled by Christ from the base of the physical difference of sex. Christ's *wherefores* and *therefores* all relate to that fact alone. It is time we did a little straight thinking on the fundamental fiat of God in regard to sex and marriage, and had some clear perception of what follows therefrom.

The family springs from the fact of physical difference of sex. Children are born because of that fact, and perhaps the most fundamental question in regard to divorce is whether children shall be family born or born of sex promiscuity or of such approximations thereto as divorce statutes or courts may allow. If a man has chosen a wife, and a woman chosen a husband, they have made an election under the Divine fiat in reference to sex — "What *therefore* God hath joined together, let not *man* put asunder." If that conclusion does not lie in the text of the Saviour, then nothing is inferable from human language.

The mystical or sacramental idea of marriage rests on the supposition of a Divine factor in it. There is, indeed, such a factor, but it antedates and surpasses any service of the church. The church is not a purveyor of the Divine element.

On the other hand, there is growing up a notion that marriage is a creature of social regulation — that society can make and unmake it. A statute is substituted for a sacrament. The family is not founded by society. It is founded by the choice of one man and one woman for each other grow-

ing out of the Divine creative fiat of sex. It takes only three parties to make a marriage—God and one man and one woman. Neither church nor state has anything to do with it, except to give it benison and to witness and protect it. The vision of common law is correct— whoever not in adultery *live* as husband and wife *are* husband and wife. Society should hold such parties to their own act. The fact of sex is an act of God. These facts are fundamental, and should never be lost to sight in reflection and discussion upon marriage. They should have controlling force in philosophy and practice.

Christ's rule, then, was definite, and was at the time definitely understood, in the same way both by Pharisees and disciples, and then it was enforced by the church through the centuries. So far from farming out to secular authorities the right to decide on cases of divorce, the church maintained its own supreme authority in the matter. Hence, in connection with other subjects but preëminently in this, there grew up the distinction between canon and civil law. The secular authorities might do what they pleased on divorce. The church stood by the rule of Christ, and made its own law upon it.

CHRIST'S EXCEPTION TO HIS RULE.

The exception will be found to be *rational*, and to give force to the rule. According to Matthew, in the fifth chapter, as also in the nineteenth, Christ said there might be divorce from the bond of matrimony in case of adultery. We shall have to deal with that exception as an utterance of Christ. It has manuscript authority behind it that cannot be gainsaid. If we are to hold that, according to Matthew, Christ said anything at all on divorce, we must hold that he made this exception, for it is twice, solid in the Greek text, and went over

into all versions. That matter may be regarded as *res adjudicata*.

A way to avoid admission of the exception is to throw it out of the text, because Luke and Mark do not have it. But when you find that Luke has but one short verse on the topic, and that Matthew has fifty more words in his account than Mark, you will see reason for putting Mark in the list with Luke and considering both as abbreviated accounts — not that Matthew has been padded with interpolations. When, further, it is considered that Matthew has the exception twice, you will conclude that it must be reckoned with as a genuine utterance of the Saviour. The argument against a well-supported text of one author (in this case two distinct texts) because of the silence of another is a dangerous weapon. You can put dynamite under the whole New Testament with it. You can throw out the whole of Matthew xix. because John has nothing corresponding to it. That gives destructive critics their whole contention. They can drive a coach and four, with outriders, front, flank, and rear, whithersoever they list. This argument *e silentio* is no older than the destructive critics of the last two centuries, and is taken from them.

Aside from its unimpeachable standing in manuscripts and versions the intense and immense rationality of the exception is muniment of title of highest authority.

Christ's exception will bear *rational analysis*. He must have made the exception, if he put marriage unity ultimately on the ground of the physical difference of sex — as he did. The rationality of Christ's exception is apparent. A married man who commits adultery has taken another woman into marriage relation to himself. Sex union is family act. Children may be born to adultery — are born to it. Not many years since a man died in this country who left, it was said, sixty

illegitimate children. If, now, you do not release the wife from the marriage bond, you compel her to live in polygamy (polygyny). She becomes the first inmate of a harem. The original family unity is gone. The wife has the right, it may be the *duty*, to say that she will not be part and parcel of polygamy, or of promiscuous cohabitation, which is the same thing.

A woman whose husband left her and cohabited with another woman was asked if she would receive him back. She said she bore him no ill will, but she did not marry to be No. 1 in polygamy. There spake the majesty of woman, wife, and mother. She brought up her children as any widow would. They became useful members of the church — one attained eminence in civic position.

A married woman who is guilty of adultery takes another man into family relation with herself. If you do not release the husband from the bond of matrimony, you compel him to live in a relation which is polyandry. If anything is plain, that is plain. It ought to be seen that Christ's exception is a necessary corollary from his rule. It is as implicit in the first answer as explicit in the second. The exception sheds light back on the primary principle with which he set out, to wit, the divinely made distinction of sex, and the family as the result of the choice of one male and one female of each other for life unity. Given the rule, the exception must have come; given exception, the rule is presupposed. It adds one more to the arguments for the divinity of Christ or for his divine legation, that his perception here is so true to the facts of the system he comes to interpret; to wit, *the right adjustment of moral beings in the physical system in which they have place*. You do not find him floating on clouds of sentimentalism. He regards *first fundamental physical facts* and speaks straight out "For the God of things as they are."

Do you mark that Christ stopped with his answer to the first question of the Pharisees with the simple repetition of the primal statement (Gen. ii. 24) of basis of marriage in the choice of *two* persons of different sex of each other? With him in this matter that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural — physical. The natural was to be moralized by being held inside the unity of *one pair*. Monogamy is not only implied in this first answer, but expressed as plainly as language can give idea. He had nothing more to say than “What *therefore* God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.”

He had answered the question of the Pharisees with an unmistakable negative. What he said in reply to their second question was simply explicatory of what he had said in reply to the first. Really if Christ had never uttered the exception of adultery in the second answer, it lies in the *monogamy* which is the essence of the first answer. Adultery is reversion to polygamy, reversion to promiscuity. Monogamy has, by adultery, ceased to be. The exception contains in substance all that Jesus taught about marriage, to wit, that it should be monogamic.

The claim is made, that what Christ said might have answered for the civilization of his time, but could not apply to the conditions of life in this age. There are some constants in nature; and religion and human law ought to respect those constants. “In the beginning God made them male and female.” That is a *constant* to this time — to be a *constant* for all the time of earth. Children are born as they were in the day of Christ. Law and religion ought to respect *that constant*. The family is as desirable an element in civilization to-day as it was nineteen centuries ago.

The family is the oldest institution known to man — older

than the state, older than the church. Family unity, genuineness, and purity ought to be *a*, perhaps *the*, chief concern of the race of man. Christ cast out polygamy as other devils. A man shall cleave to his wife, and *the two* shall become *one flesh*. So that *they* are no more *two*, but *one flesh*. "What *therefore* God hath joined together, let not *man* put asunder."

Monogamy is inherent, pervasive, an underlying subsumption in Christ's words. Divorce with permission to marry is barred because of its essential destruction of monogamy and family unity. Divorce is evasion. It is a substitute for polygamy. Christ denied it.

Cruelty to a wife or desertion of her does not practise family sex function — institute polygamy — beget children by another woman — as fornication, adultery, does. The stupidity that compares cruelty with adultery is an astonishment. The two things are not comparable. It is like saying a mountain is as high as a plain is flat — that snow is as white as vinegar is sour. If you want to go over to polygamy, then condone, excuse, or minimize adultery, and you are on a high road that leads to polygamy.

This is the sum of the matter about the criticism of the text of the Gospels. Monogamy is imbedded in all three of the Evangelists. It is to be inferred from all. Divorce granted with liberty of remarriage in every case excepting that of adultery lands in polygamy — withheld in case of adultery lands in polygamy. In Matthew, Jesus has twice expressed this latter fact and principle. Whichever way you depart from Christ as recorded in Matthew xix., you are landed in polygamy.

Right before your eyes Luke's is an abridged account as against Mark, and is a mere mnemonic of the monogamic principle taught by Christ. Mark is abridged as against

Matthew. All three preserved the same base idea — monogamy. Therefrom springs, by inference, whatever is essential to monogamy. Psychologically Matthew's is the most natural description of the particulars of the discussion. I would like to go before the United States Supreme Court on the question, Who introduced Moses into the discussion? According to Mark, Jesus did it. According to Matthew, the Pharisees. Just read the two accounts together, and decide for yourselves which is the most natural. According to Matthew, Jesus disposed of the matter at issue without a reference to Moses, and then the Jews sprang their second question, Ah, but what will you do with Moses? According to Mark, Jesus himself brought in Moses, an authority on the face of the case against himself, and then explained him away. That is not good psychology. It is bad argumentative form. It is apparent that Mark in epitomizing the discussion has confused the order — just what you might expect from a condensing secondhand reporter. Matthew puts antecedents and sequences in such order as you would think would come direct from the keen perception of Jesus. The Master himself is on deck in Matthew. This then is the result we reach from the teaching of Christ — in and about marriage — Thou mayest develop sentiment ethereal in quality and empyrean in altitude, but back of monogamy, physically, thou shalt not go.

PAUL.

Paul has nowhere treated of divorce. That he did is an idea that grew up since the days of Charlemagne. It did not come to the front when the pinch of the trouble was felt through all the days of conflict with heathenism in the Roman Empire. If the church did not know of such construction of Paul in the early centuries, it is better to be shy of it in the later.

In regard to marriage, or marriage troubles, Paul was a quietist. His philosophy was exactly, Brethren, let each man, wherein he was called, therein abide with God. If he made any suggestion about wrongs in married life, it was that the party who was in the right should keep still. That certainly would not authorize one to procure a divorce and marry some one else. Nor would it prevent one who had been brought into polygyny or poiandry by the wrong of the other from terminating the polygyny or polyandry. Much has been read into Paul which is not there. But the seventh chapter of First Corinthians is the best ethical tonic for right sex and marriage relation ever prescribed by man. There is not a sentence in Paul that adds to or takes from what Christ laid down in the nineteenth chapter of Matthew. So we are remanded to that chapter as the full and final teaching of Christ and of Scripture on the subject of divorce, and as setting forth the first and last and supreme rationality pertaining to marriage.

SOCIOLOGY.

Now open the question in the courts of sociology.

The world may wander forty years or forty centuries in the wilderness of experiments and statistics, and, unless it goes to perdition, it will return to the nineteenth chapter of Matthew as the *supreme rationality in regard to marriage and divorce*. If we dismiss Christ's *authority*, his judgment will stand as *reason*. The race of man will be monogamous, and cut up, root and branch, all polygamy and all legal and statutory protections of it, or of approximations to it.

The first thing that will be perceived is that divorce induces the very evil it professes to alleviate. Apologists for divorce bring forward the miseries of partners that have become alienated from each other. It is apparent, on the face of the

matter, that as you make a way out of marriage you are inducing carelessness about entering it. When one woman is divorced for the cruelty or drunkenness of her husband, ten women are taught to be reckless about marrying a man who is likely to become drunken or cruel. A vicious paternalism comes to the front in society here. It takes the burden off the parties deliberating about marriage, and assumes to furnish happiness for them if they make a mistake. A few years ago in Chicago there were two thousand cases of desertion in which public aid was asked for the deserted families. It is safe to say that there would have been one thousand less cases calling for public charity had not the permission of divorce for desertion stood in the statutes of this and neighboring or distant States. It is even quite probable that there would have been, at the outset, a thousand less marriages that came ultimately to call for charity, if the parties thereto had plainly understood that they would be held inexorably to their marriage. It is common hearing over a long line of our social life, "Well, if my husband were to do so and so, I'd get a divorce." The girls in the kitchen say it and the scholars in the schools. There is where we are. The common consciousness of the ease of breaking up marriage disarms caution about the character of a partner.

Divorce may give deliverance from the ills of marriage, but it is as well a swivel door that lets the heedless into them. It is not necessary to argue this—it is open fact. Our divorce statutes do not diminish the sum total of evil in marriage; they tend to increase it.

There is one other important matter which they make us forget, and that is that it is possible for the power of society to be brought to bear to restrain and eliminate the evils in marriage. For about three-quarters of a century we have

been saying every time wrong is disclosed in marriage, Break it up. Had the force that has been spent on disruption of marriage been put on removing the evils found in it, we should be on a vastly higher social plane than we are. The husband that is cruel in marriage can be punished because he is cruel in that specific relation. The husband that is drunken and fails to support his wife can be put to work for the public. The man that deserts his family can be brought back and given the choice to work for the public or his family. Most of the troubles in such cases would never have existed if society had laws and courts and officers to act in the premises. If the troubles did exist they would be found as amenable to law and social sentiment as any other crimes and misdemeanors. We have been blundering along on the wrong track, when a high passable road lay open to us which we ought to have had wit enough to discern and pursue.

What is all our legislative and judicial and police apparatus for except to enact and enforce law to aid and protect the most fundamental institution of human society—the family—and to appear in kindly potency in its troubles? Just think of all this machinery—

“As idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean.”

Such social helplessness is idiotic.

After having scornfully rejected the right way for a generation or more, we are now turning toward it. We have now put on the statute book an act for separate maintenance. Within a few years, in some States, we have made desertion a crime or misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment. Both these acts are in the right direction. They show that something can be done, by direct action on the ills of married life, without proceeding at once to its annulment. There is no limit in sight to possibilities in this direction.

We already have a juvenile court; why not a court for matrimonial causes, domestic relations, as is done in England, to which all troubles in marriage may be sent for equitable action according to their nature? We need not make a separate court; such cases could be committed to our present courts of common law and equity jurisdiction. In this way we could restore the principle of divorce *a mensa et toro*. That, one may say, is a step backward toward ecclesiastical law. Suppose it is, what of it? The church always knew better than any one else what to do with wrongs in marriage. It had for them its processes of discipline. The power of the keys gave it power over men. When its ghostly terrors — as refusal of the sacraments, of burial in consecrated ground, and ultimately excommunication — failed, society should have put secular processes of regulation in their place, instead of throwing away the idea of discipline.

Here we might ask, Who is responsible for the present confusion in regard to divorce in this nation, from which even secular society is crying out, "Good Lord, deliver us"? Certainly it is not the church. It is just because the state has treated with contempt the wisdom of the church that we are in this present condition of distraction. The church has not asked for the existing divorce statutes. The Catholic Church has not asked for them; neither have the Protestant denominations.

I see that a university professor says that the Puritans are responsible for the introduction of our free divorce laws. Because the Puritans did not bring ecclesiastical law with them, as they did not, it does not follow that they did not bring the morality in respect to marriage which was imbedded in ecclesiastical law. It is a remarkable statement that our freedom of divorce is derived from the Puritans. Down to 1836

—that is, for two hundred years of Puritan history in Massachusetts—divorce was allowed from the bond of marriage for only two causes—adultery and impotency. Divorce for desertion was not allowed till 1838. The responsibility of the Puritans for our present condition is not very apparent.

Our present condition is excuseless. There is no necessity for its existence. If we were to repeal all our divorce laws to-day, neither to-morrow nor any other day would trouble arise in society. Add a new clause to the divorce statute, and new cases will appear in the courts. Strike out a clause, and a set of cases will disappear. The repeal of a clause has in some States lessened the entries on the dockets of the courts by scores and even hundreds. Yet society has received no damage. There has never been a public meeting held in a State in this nation to advocate the placing of a single clause in our divorce statutes, nor a single meeting to protest against the removal of a clause therefrom.

It seems to be assumed that our divorce laws represent public sentiment. They do not. They are the product neither of the conscience nor the common sense of the country. They are simply the sufferance of public carelessness and of the inertia that dislikes to attack even a patent public evil. That is all the strength there is in the divorce situation of to-day. "While men slept, an enemy sowed tares."

Just how radical is the remedy demanded for the present divorce situation,—how revolutionary is the end sought? What is asked is only what was substantially universal law in the country down to a period within the memory of men still living. What is asked is a state of things so tolerable that the people of England and of Canada and of the state of New York live in it without public suffering or disturbance. Nothing new is asked, nothing fanciful, nothing impracticable.

The public mind seems to be stupefied as though there were some great mystery involved in settling upon a proper statute. The way is as plain as a section line road. There are people to whom it seems to be natural *nodum in scirpo quaerere*, 'to hunt for a knot in a bulrush,' — a difficulty where there is none.

The senselessness of our divorce laws cannot be better set forth than by the following statistics, for which I am indebted to Professor W. S. Harwood, of the University of Chicago.¹ In thirty-four years from 1867 to 1901, 69 divorces were granted in Canada — 700,000 in the United States. The population of Ohio is about equal to that of Canada. In 1899 Ohio granted 3000 divorces, Canada 4. Yet life has been tolerable in Canada. The truth is that the divorces in this country, in the main, are an idle, excuseless present to foolishness and the flesh. Some one will say that England, New York, and Canada have sex vice. Certainly, but it stands as sex vice. The law does not palliate or condone it.

The argument is made that if society does not grant divorce, there will be more open adultery. That is doubted. But, suppose it were true, is society to be bulldozed into granting the privileges of polygamy by threats of adultery? Practically that threat would be idle. Even without any law to punish adultery, few people would be found to brave the public sentiment against it. In the very great majority of cases where divorces are now granted, if the divorces were refused, there would be no defiance of law. Parties crave the defense of a statute to make a new sex relation respectable. The argument for purity by way of divorce is simply silly — is a cowardly surrender to a bluff of sin.

¹ World of To-day, February, 1904.

Now it may be said that with all the disintegration of our divorce laws we have yet a very wholesome public sentiment and even practice in regard to marriage. Heaven be praised that is true. But the end is not yet. The returns of the influence of our divorce laws are not all in. We have only under observation the effect on one generation; for the great tide of freedom of divorce began to run scarcely more than half a century ago. When society gets once adjusted to the idea that the continuance of marriage is at the option of the parties, and to that result opinion and practice is gravitating, what reverence for it will be left? If the following instances illustrate what now is, what will be the estimate of marriage in the generation to come?

"Sue, who is your father now?" "Oh, so and so." "Well, you'll get tired of him. I had him for a father once. He is no good. You'll be glad when he is gone." Where is the family? Two boys come skipping down the walk from a house. They meet a man going up to the house. They say to him, "Papa, tell mamma when she comes that we have gone to ride with father" — which latter personage sits in a carriage at the gate. Where is the family?

Are the girls in the first case likely to have very exalted ideas of the sanctity of marriage either before or after their own experiments in it? When passion's storm and stress come to those boys, are they very likely to have any restraining influences from the ideal of family unity and of unbroken purity of marriage life? No, no, we are not in the rapids yet, but they lie only a generation or two ahead.

One divorce for every four marriages in Kansas City! How far are we from the rapids of family disintegration?

That children ought not to be brought up in an atmosphere of conjugal disharmony is a plea for freedom of divorce.

That is shallow reasoning. What has been said before about the non-appearance of evils in marriage, if the parties thereto know that they must make adjustment to each other and know that they cannot escape from the existing into a new marriage relation, will apply here. Hume was not a traditionalist, was he? Yet he said: "We must consider that nothing is more dangerous than to unite two persons so closely in all their interests and concerns as husband and wife without rendering the union entire and total. How many frivolous quarrels are there which people of common prudence endeavor to forget, when they lie under the necessity of passing their lives together, but which would soon be inflamed into the most deadly hatred were they pursued to the utmost under the prospect of an easy separation!"

Gibbon was a free thinker, was he not? And he says: "A specious theory is confuted by this free and perfect experiment at Rome, which demonstrates that the liberty of divorce does not contribute to happiness and virtue. The facility of separation would destroy all mutual confidence and inflame every trifling dispute."

Indeed, disharmony in the family relation is a serious evil, but there is something worse than that for children, and that is that there be no family relation at all. The first right of a child is to be family born, and the second right is to be family bred, and the third right is to be family inspired — to have the family idea ineradicably inwrought in the structure of his being. A child so born, bred, and inspired, on coming to maturity will bring no disharmony into marriage. Such a child will be careful about forming a life bond, and will heroically bear infelicities if they appear in it.

Murder and adultery ought to be held in the same estimate; the one wrongfully sends a being out of this system of

existence; the other wrongfully brings a being in. And there is as much malice aforethought in the latter as in the former case. It is as inexcusable.

A Christian altruism must look the generations in the face as well as an individual. Even patriotism does that.

Some one says: "Our traditions make against sacrificing the individual to society." But that is bad politics, to say nothing of religion. When have our traditions held that the privileges or even the rights of the few should override those of the many? Who in history have claimed that the whim or will, or the ill, of an individual in regard to divorce, or anything else, should be respected in derogation of the weal of society and of posterity? "A little child shall lead them."

An institution is more valuable than an individual. We sacrificed in 1861-65 lives by the hundred thousand, with attendant woe and sorrow, for an institution — the Union.

Moralized monogamic marriage is worth more to the nation than the union of the States.

We ought not to be any more willing to go back to the license of polygamy or promiscuity than to slavery; yet divorce statutes point in that direction. We fumble over the matter and pull up a decree of a court as a blanket to cover our nakedness, but in principle we reach in divorce the same result as the Sultan of Turkey with his harem. The sex unions of polygamy and divorce, *in rerum natura*, are alike consecutive, not simultaneous. We dethrone monogamy and enthrone polygamy. We ought not to give up the monogamic family to gratify criminals and to remedy the mistakes of fools. We provide for secession from the family when our word ought to be "UNION NOW AND FOREVER, ONE AND INSEPARABLE."

Here we ought to notice our haste to institute polygamy. Jacob waited seven years before he began his. But in many

States we authorize its beginning on the docketing a decree. "The divorce baked meats do hotly furnish forth the polygamy table."

UNIFORM DIVORCE LAW.

I marvel at the contentment which so many excellent people seem to have with the idea of a national uniform divorce law. They assume that that would end all our trouble. Now trouble with divorce goes not out that way. It is easy enough to call out of the vasty deep a uniform divorce law, but will you be satisfied with it when you get it? The question of *right* in a law deserves consideration before the matter of its *uniformity*. There is nothing more fearful, more to be dreaded, than wrong intrenched in law. We had a uniform fugitive slave law — did its uniformity make it right? Yet that law had a terrible hold on the public mind just because it was *law*. In the South there is a public sentiment, which is even crystalizing into law, reducing the negro from a citizen to a peon or a thrall: if that sentiment becomes uniform, will it with its resultant law be right? Yet what force that sentiment is acquiring even at the North, just because the ægis of enactment into statute is spread over it! If we are to judge by experience, we ought to fear any one bringing us the present of a uniform law on divorce. The probability is that it would be a delusion and a snare. The prime matter is not one of uniformity, but one of right. We lament the present confusion. But the little finger of wrong intrenched in a uniform law might be thicker than the loins of the wrong in the present confusion. Let us speak less of uniformity till we can tell clearly in what the uniformity should consist. Righteousness may tend to uniformity in law, but uniformity is no guaranty of right.

About as far as thought usually goes in this matter is that a uniform national law would prevent migration from State to State for the sake of divorce. But that is an inappreciable element in the divorce business, a negligible quantity. The statistics are sky-high now to show that the divorce business of a State arises under state law from parties living in the State. Divorce suits in Illinois are brought by partners *bona fide* resident in Illinois, before Illinois courts, under an Illinois statute. The statute of Illinois is uniform over the State. You have uniformity in the State; shall we recommend to the other States of the nation the adoption of the Illinois statute? If not, why not? We are brought face to face with the question of the ethics of divorce law — just where we ought to be brought — to the necessity of determining what we will and what we will not justify as divorce law, what we will and what we will not recommend to the States of the nation for adoption — charged with the duty of determining what in divorce would be right. It is better not to cry for a uniform divorce law till we know what it is to be.

Why continue to call upon somebody to draw up a bill for uniform divorce when the proposition has been twice conspicuously, if not contemptuously, turned down? A few years since a commission was appointed by the governors of many States. But their work came to naught. They were not prepared to recommend any particular statute. One that came nearest to adoption had all the vices in it of the average of the existing statutes. What profit would we have if the same amount of divorce as now came out of such a law?

The American Bar Association had a committee for years on the clauses of a divorce statute, but that committee has been discharged from further consideration of the matter. Why bawl to Baal when we get no sign that he intends to

hear? *O sancta simplicitas sanctorum!* Do we issue checks in blank and give to every stroller? Ought not as much care to be taken about the filling of a divorce law as of a check? The character of a statute should first be considered, inquisition made upon the wrong which it might incorporate and entail upon society.

The Inter-Church Conference has ceased advocacy of a Jack-o'-lantern chase after a constitutional amendment and a uniform law under it. That conference seems to prefer work upon the statutes of the States. This attitude is correct. But upon what the law should be, there has been no deliverance. If we want the nation or the States to have a uniform law, let us tell the nation or the States what law we want — what the provisions ought to be.

The great hindrance in the way of reaching a right result is that so many people want to solve all questions of casuistry, to provide for all exceptions of which they can conceive — exceptions most probably hypothetical, academic, or if actual yet rare. There will be difficulties and infelicities in every system of social regulation. It may not argue great scope of wisdom to find fault or pick a flaw. Nothing is perfect.

As excuse for free divorce, it is said that it is hard to prove adultery. Well, what shall we do? Shall we enact a law that will open the door of divorce in suspected cases? Shall we allow other grounds of divorce in order to help a partner who cannot prove a case? Then we shall have to enact just what we have — laws so open that all marriage can run through them.

Adultery hard to prove! God be praised it is. If a thing is hard to prove there is little of it. Radium does not lie about like rocks. Hard to prove! Yet in 1904 more than a thousand cases were proved in the city of New York, and

more than four hundred in the city of Chicago—enough to bear the testimony of society against the crime.

Suppose some person who might be entitled to divorce cannot make a second marriage for want of proof of adultery unless a statute has large facilities for divorce for other causes. What of it? There are a great many people who are not married at all, who live honorable lives, and their cases do not trouble us. Why this intense desire to help some one who has made a failure in marriage to make, most probably, another failure? The main objection we have to divorce statutes now is the *amount* of disruption of marriage which takes place under them. Would that objection cease if the same amount were done under a uniform law? Why ask for that which we should not be satisfied with when enacted? It is to be hoped there is righteousness enough left in religion yet to be dissatisfied with what is wrong.

No, let judgment begin at the house of God. Primarily divorce is an ethical and religious question. It is a question raised in the Scriptures, which set out, at least, "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ." If, in a matter of such import, the church cannot make a definite statement of its desires and demands, then, let it, for the benefit of the world, make assignment of its function as a teacher of righteousness and go out of business.

I will now return to our point of departure. The vision of Jesus on divorce, set forth in the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, will never be surpassed. His teaching is right and practicable, and church and state ought to conspire to give it force in social estimate and in law.

The Christian and the civilized world are called upon with peculiar emphasis to choose this day whom they will serve

in setting up their ideal for marriage. Shall it be sentimental hedonism, careless of family unity, or moralized monogamy? Goethe said: "What culture has won from nature we ought on no account to let go again, at no price to give up. In the notion of the sacredness of marriage Christianity has got a culture conquest of this kind, and of priceless value."

It is a long, long way we have to come to reach the sublime heights we have attained in the sex relation. If I wanted to make an argument for the existence of God, I would take the line which shows what the Brooding Spirit has wrought in man from animalism and savagery and barbarism up to — say — "The Cottar's Saturday Night" or "Snow-Bound." What hath not God wrought? We can see the path of his spirit. Let us adore! Let us rejoice and be glad that we are where we are on that upward climb! But the work is unfinished, and we can be coworkers with God in an end more blessed still further on.

There are two eddies clearly to be seen setting backward to the great "Serbonian bog" of animal passion whence we came — the Redlight District and Divorce. With these two conspirators and with the propensities and influences that support them, we must deal. There is work to be done along the whole sex line to secure the practice of the Christian ideal.

The moralization of sex is more radical and important than that of industry. An article in a recent periodical puts forward this instance as showing the need of readjustment of rewards to industry. Here is a man with six children two years apart in age. He has never had more than forty-six dollars a month — a sum inadequate to family support and education of the children — and so society must supply the want — hence greater wages for the wage earner. But there is another *hence* about such case. What moral right has a man

as against society, against his wife, against his children, and against himself to bring children into the world as fast as they can come, with no probability before him that he can support them? On the other hand, everywhere the four hundred — the born in the purple of wealth — are comparatively barren. This is not lamentable. They do not furnish a hopeful environment. There is an ethics prior to the industrial ethics, to wit, sex ethics.

Moralization in the struggle for existence must begin back here in the moralization of sex propensity — in penury and plethora — as *well in* marriage as *out of* it. The time will never come, and never *ought* to come, when parents will be relieved from care about the nurture of their children.

“Lord, who ordainest for mankind
Benignant tolls and tender cares,
We thank thee for the tie that binds
The mother to the child she bears.”

It is to be hoped that no industrial arrangement can be made that will relieve mankind from the moral pressure of those

“Benignant tolls and tender cares.”

We are not animals to breed and fish to spawn, and throw upon nature or society care for those we bring into existence. We are “rational and accountable creatures,” and are and ought to be held to responsibility as well *in marriage* as elsewhere. We ought to begin to see the unbounded range of moralization of *family life*. Yet who cultivates this field? Great is the field! At least half the life of the race is concerned with sex:—

Father, Mother, Son, Daughter, Brother, Sister, Lover, Husband, Wife, Family, Grandfather, Grandmother, Uncles, Aunts, Cousins near and remote, society. I envy the rising

generation of students the privilege of being a force for moralization in these relations. May they have courage and discretion to inspire in this realm to that purity of life and nobility of being which can stand inspection from the on- and in-gazing God.

ARTICLE IV.

CATHOLICISM AND AMERICANISM.

BY AUSTIN BIERBOWER, ESQ., CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

NO POWER, perhaps, so tends to modify our American institutions and adversely affect the world's progress as the Roman Catholic Church. The three ideas which underlie alike our government and man's intellectual advancement are liberty, equality, and education. These embrace a variety of principles which find expression in our institutions, literature, and opinions; and these I shall consider with reference to this church.

The Roman Catholic Church is the most un-American, because most controlled by foreign influence. Others have severed their connection with other countries and other ages. While holding friendly relations with churches everywhere, and considering ancient claims on their merits, the Protestant churches in America acknowledge no supremacy out of America. They are modern and local churches, holding that the people of the time and place should control their religion. As Roman Catholics, however, claim their church to be everywhere and always the same, they are largely controlled by other times and lands; so they have not the spirit of our age and country as Protestants have.

The principal idea of Roman Catholicism, which underlies its whole political and intellectual policy, is inequality, which is the opposite of our American principle, and places this church in opposition to our distinctively American aims. And

for this antagonism there is no remedy till the church ceases to be Catholic or our people to be American; and, as the Catholic Church is committed by its past against fundamental changes, and our people, by their increasing love of liberty and force of scientific thinking, are journeying in the opposite direction, there will never be a reconciliation, but rather a fatal conflict between the two.

This inequality of Catholicism appears, first, in the radical distinction between the clergy and the people, in which the former are deemed superiors, with a right of rule, and the latter subjects, obedient to them in the most important matters of life. The difference is radical, and of divine origin and sanction, and the separation final. The clergy, by reason of some "grace" or "initiation," are never, when once clergy, anything else, and the people never assume their functions. Not only is it sacrilege to attempt it, but it has no effect if they do. Special powers are ascribed to the clergy, such as to change bread into the body of Christ, to declare the forgiveness of sins, to absolve from obligations, and to bind men in ways from which they alone can release them — in short, the clergy are thought to have many of the powers of deity and to direct what God may do with men. They are so superior as to be almost superhuman, and the people, in that proportion, so degraded as to be almost below human.

With such differences in power the two classes are almost distinct species; and it is not a difference that can be bridged. The power is in the one, the impotence in the other. The people are dependent on the priests for all they get of certain things, and these things are held to be most vital to them. The dependence of the masses is absolute, and their capacity for revolt gone. Kings and noblemen claim no such supremacy

and no such powers. Since the king was thought to cure scrofula, no supernatural capacity is attributed to state officials. The clergy alone constitute a class with miraculous powers, and are alone above men as men.

It is obvious that where such views prevail, equality cannot exist. The supernaturally endowed can never deem themselves the equals of a class who lack their power; and the latter must always look to such superiors and receive orders from them. Where the doctrine of inequality is thus entrenched there will be a corresponding difference in the functions of the two classes. One will be ruling, the other ruled; one supported, the other supporting; one feared, the other fearing; one honored, the other honoring. Authority will vest in one, and submission in the other. The priest will be leader and the people led, the former master and the latter servants or subjects. No people can believe in such differences between classes without conceding corresponding differences of power and honor. Life must be regulated on the theory of a difference in the nature of men, and the favored will have one set of functions and the unfavored another, and the two will be separated by the most impassable barriers.

So we find the Catholic Church claiming the divine right of the clergy to rule. As the clergy alone control the church, they naturally make this claim, which is simply a claim for themselves to rule. It would be strange if a class that believed themselves endowed with superhuman power did not take advantage of it to dominate those who are without it. The divine right of kings is here reproduced as the divine right of pope, bishop, and priest. The power which these have over the people they claim to have from God, and to exercise in his name. The church is the authoritative ruler of the people. Its rule extends to all religious, moral, and

educational matters, which, as interpreted by the priests, includes everything, as we shall see; so that the control of the clergy is practically unlimited. There is no appeal from them. Laymen have no jurisdiction over them. All appeals are to the clergy. There is no constitution or reserved rights which the people may invoke against clerical tyranny. The clergy are the sole interpreters of any supposed limit to ecclesiastical authority. They alone constitute the ruling power in the Catholic Church. Those who are ruled have no part in making the laws by which they are ruled; nor can they participate in the administration of those laws. The people are only obeyers and followers.

So while the Catholic Church teaches the divine right of one class to rule, it teaches the equally divine right of others to obey. There is, accordingly, in the Catholic Church, a defined class of followers or subjects — men subject to others, who may not assert their own judgment, but must get their opinions and orders from another class, and content themselves to be a led people — who must be obedient instead of inquisitive or determining. Catholicism teaches that there are powers dangerous for the people to have. There are, in its view, thoughts which they should not think; and sacrilege, or some other sin, attaches to all attempts at independence, or assumption to think for themselves.

Catholic virtues imply weakness. Catholics assume inability in themselves, and power in others. They are disqualified for rulers; so that Catholics are chiefly subject peoples. In Ireland, Poland, and other countries where they are in the majority, they are ruled by other faiths. It is the Protestant nations that control the world — England, Germany, Russia, and America. The Catholic states of Italy, Spain, France, Austria, and South America have little weight

in the council of nations. The Catholic people, not being trained to independence or mastership, rarely take the initiative, or assume the higher functions of power, which demand the spirit of supremacy.

By reason of its principles of subjection, the Catholic Church has favorably regarded slavery. Though this institution has existed in some form from the commencement of this church, it has never been officially condemned by it. Catholics always held slaves as a matter not repugnant to their religion, and white slaves as well as black. Discipline for slaveholding as a sin was never practised. Its disappearance from the civilized world has been slowest and last from Catholic countries. While slavery lasted in the United States, Catholics generally favored its perpetuation. Few were abolitionists. While Catholics, like all other good people, sought to mitigate its rigors, they were in sympathy with its spirit. Being subjects themselves, the idea was congenial to them. Men ought not, they thought, to revolt against subjection. The idea of the inferiority of a race which was to be treated as inferiors was easily recognized. The purpose of God was seen in their subjection, and their obedience was deemed a type of the whole divine system. Slavery was easily acceptable as a divine provision to those who believed in the divine right of special classes to rule. Abolitionists were denounced as infidels, the abolition movement as atheistic, and the revolt of the slaves as an act of disobedience to God. And, though Catholics were not alone among Christians in these views, they were most consistent and uniform in them. The Catholic Church was the only branch of Christianity that could congenially and permanently adapt itself to slavery. It had a code for master and for slave; it recognized the "duties" and "rights" of each; it labored for the welfare of the slave

while recognizing the power of the master over him, and taught obedience from the one as well as kindness from the other. Had the Catholic Church undisputed possession of the country there would have been no serious controversy over slavery. And though Catholicism can adjust itself to liberty, and has done so in most countries, so that it is no longer favorable to slavery there, this adjustment is like that which it makes to republicanism. It can be republican at the same time that it is not hostile to monarchy. In France to-day it is largely republican and fast becoming more so. Popular sentiment compels them to this.

In foreign countries, Catholics generally belong to the Conservative, or royal, party, not to the Liberal, or progressive, party. They are the party of privilege, of special classes, and of the repression of the people. They constitute the Right, the Bourbon, the Clerical, and the Ultramontane factions. In France they were till recently the Monarchists, the cause of the church and of royalty being deemed the same. In the South American states the Republican party is anti-Catholic, or anti-clerical, the priests and those who follow them being regarded as the monarchical element. The church is everywhere known as the reactionary party, favoring some revolt from the republican idea of equality. It demands extension in power for some other class than the whole people. The cause of liberality is everywhere the cause antagonistic to Catholic interests, and Catholics are arrayed against it. Liberals fear Catholics as their chief foes. The popular party is the anti-clerical party.

The history of liberty is mainly a history of the conflict between Catholicism and popular rights. Men aim, in seeking their rights, to get some disability removed which was imposed by the church. The battles for intellectual liberty were

fought mainly against this power. The civil rights of the people were generally wrested from this church, or from those controlled by it or acting in its interest. Persecution was inflicted for the benefit of the church. Most battles for liberty in England were fought against the clerical party. The pope, bishops, and great mass of the clergy advocated some subjection. Especially since the Reformation have Catholics been arrayed against popular liberty. They opposed the independence of England when Henry the Eighth sought to terminate the supremacy of Rome. They sought to reimpose, in every subsequent reign, the domination of the pope in some respect. They espoused the cause of Queen Mary, of Charles I., of Charles II., and of James II. in their conflicts with the people. Most that was gained in the cause of liberty was taken from this church. In France the liberties demanded by the people, and especially their participation in power, were likewise demanded of the church party, or of the government controlled by the clergy. The same is true in Spain and Portugal to-day. The edict of Nantes was wrested from Catholics, and its revocation accomplished in their interest. Nearly every pretext for oppression was made on the ground that the interests of the church required it.

Only when Catholics themselves have sought liberty have they espoused the cause of liberty — never when liberty was sought for the whole people. When Catholics themselves have nothing to gain, they aid the Conservatives. While they demand greater liberty for the Catholic Irish, for example, they oppose liberty for Protestants in Rome, Spain, and South America.

There is no lay rule in the Catholic Church. The idea of rank runs all through ecclesiastical government. The masses are to be ruled, instead of ruling. Religion is something to

be given them, not received through them. The priests alone conduct the government of the Catholic Church. The people, who are most concerned, have no voice in it. The only part played by the people is obedience. The masses pay the bills, but have no voice in disposing of the money. Catholic Church government is an aristocracy, whose power is absolute.

Clerical rule is not only exclusive, but secret. The masses may not know, any more than participate in, what is done in the church councils. The sessions of these are secret; their discussions are not reported; all is considered and decided without the knowledge of the outside world, and is then simply handed out for the lower classes to accept and follow. The strength of Catholicism is largely in its secrecy of counsel. The church rulers constitute the greatest secret society on earth. Did the masses know what occurs behind the closed doors, they would differently regard the clergy. Secrecy is necessary to inspire awe in a ruled body. The unknown plays the most important part in Catholic faith and obedience. As long as one class can believe that another class knows what it does not, it will be subject to it, as it is when it believes that such a class has a power which it has not.

There are occasional conventions of Catholic laymen, the result of, or concession to, the American spirit, but these conventions have no power in the church. Wholly unofficial, they impose no obligations on clergy or people. They are only for discussion and declaration of obedience to the clergy. They are held under the supervision of the priests. The clergy control the discussions, map out the conclusions to be reached, and formulate the declarations to be made. Such gatherings are intended to reflect the clergy, and are condemned and dispersed when they suggest new teachings, or

exhibit independence of their superiors. Any suggestion of serious modification in the conduct of the church is treated as disloyalty, or, at least, impertinence. The principal lesson taught to laymen is to know their place, and not rise above it as the equals of the priests.

There are lay societies of a benevolent or social character, but even these are under the clergy. They have a chaplain or spiritual adviser, as a rule, and they are carefully guarded against acts and utterances which ignore the superiority of the clergy. When they show signs of revolt against the sacred classes, they are admonished, and, if the revolt continues, disbanded. No matter what their object — whether political, literary, or musical — they disband if ordered. They generally get the blessing of the clergy on their organization as a guarantee of its legitimacy or security; and, while the societies or meetings of the clergy are secret above all others, those of laymen must be open to the clergy. Secret societies among the people are prohibited, while among the clergy they are required. The higher classes have a monopoly of secrecy. The most secret of all societies is most hostile to secret societies. One never tolerates in another that of which he himself wants the monopoly.

The inferiority of the people is recognized and enforced in many other ways by the Catholic Church. The people must confess to the priests, telling their secrets, and putting themselves in their power. The forgiveness of sins is made dependent on such confession. Laymen may not know what the clergy do not. Knowledge is guilty when not shared with the priest. The people must fear what they know, and get permission even for information. It is judged dangerous for the lower classes to know what the higher do not. The priests must be kept informed of what is transpiring. The minds of

laymen must be disclosed to them. Anything of moment must especially be revealed. A scheme to secure their own liberties would have to be disclosed before the masses could act upon it, and it naturally follows that many enterprises of the people are headed off by the knowledge which they are required to give to the higher classes. The priests thus get at the very minds of the people, whose thoughts they control before they are yet fully formed, or translated into action. They not only prohibit certain thoughts in the masses, but know what the masses actually do think. They both give commands and know whether they are obeyed.

And while laymen thus communicate everything to the priest, the priest never returns the favor. The clergy do not confess to the people. There is no intercommunion of thought. The tracks all point one way. The lower confesses only to the higher, and the higher in each case absolves the lower. There is a gradation in confession, as in everything else Catholic. The people may get orders from the priests — something which they can obey — but not confessions — something which they may learn. The people are thought to have no use for what the priests know, and certainly no right to it as inferiors.

To make the people more willing to tell their secrets, and more satisfied in having them shared, they are taught that they are confessed to God, not to man; just as they are taught that the power which they exercise over the people comes from God instead of man. Subjection becomes easy if it is believed to be subjection to God; and, under such persuasion, men not only practise obedience, but count it sacred. What is but meanness thus becomes a virtue, and Catholics subject themselves to others under the impression that it is to God, which impression the others of course eagerly promote.

This act of subjection is more effectually compelled because many things desired by Catholics are obtainable only through it, as we have seen; such as the remission of sins, admission to the Eucharist, and church marriage. Not only are the chief benefits of religion at the disposal of the priests, but they are imparted only on some special expression by the people of their inferiority or subjection to the clergy; and since many of these benefits, to have value, must be given frequently, there is provision for not only subjection, but the repeated expression of it. By the oft-recurring observances of "obligation," laymen are perpetually reminded of their inferiority, and priests kept assured that the popular subjection is continued. The clergy have severe penalties for insubordination. Penances, excommunication, and the denial of special privileges are repeatedly threatened and often inflicted, and terrible calamities are alleged to follow them.

The clergy are also ready with rewards for those who prove faithful in their subjection, such as indulgences, and various sacramental graces; and great importance is attached to these. Between the penalties and the rewards, therefore, which the priests offer, and which mostly extend to the next world, and last through eternity, the masses are kept in subservience, their fears and hopes being about exhausted in this way.

Catholic laymen may not read with freedom. While the rest of the world go through all literature, and select what suits their taste, Catholics are restrained within narrow limits, others besides themselves fixing what they may read. They may no more know what others think than think their own thoughts without permission. The highest authorities provide an index of books which the faithful may not read. This index contains many of the world's best productions,

without which none can be abreast of scholars in science, history, or other departments. In still other ways much literature is kept from the masses.

The Bible itself may not be read generally, or placed in the hands of all the people, as among Protestants. The very book on which their religion rests is feared, and the clergy forbid its use except under the direction of superiors. Their faith in God is such that they dare not let him speak directly to the people, lest he injure them, but only after his words have been subjected to the censorship of the priests.

There is like opposition to the free use of newspapers by Catholic laymen. That they may read nothing that will "injure their faith," or impair their subjection to the clergy, they are warned against many publications, and encouraged to patronize others conducted with special reference to their church requirements. In most cities, at least one paper is pledged to print nothing that will disturb Catholic views. Without confidence in free discussion, they hold that the masses were not intended to consider the claims of the church or to participate in the clash of intellectual views, but rather to be protected from controversy, and to have opinions suitable for them prepared by the clergy and presented to them readymade.

Catholic laymen are also carefully kept from public libraries and reading-rooms, lest they read what may be detrimental to their faith. Libraries of their own are established, not so much to furnish reading matter as to keep Catholics from patronizing others. They provide a substitute for public libraries, as they do for public schools. Furnishing chiefly Catholic literature, which is meager, and to most persons insipid, such libraries repress rather than encourage reading, in which they do their chief service to Catholicism. For a

reading people is not a submissive people. Readers think, and thought soon makes men independent, and independence is not compatible with subjection. The Catholic press is strongly opposed to Carnegie libraries.

Catholic laymen are not, as a rule, educated. The policy of the church regarding education is to train a few. It has never favored universal education. In the old cloisters only priests and nobles, as a rule, were taught—those who had to rule the masses. They were part of a royal or aristocratic system. Catholic education has never been democratic, except as, in recent times, universal education has been enforced by the non-Catholic element.

Especially is compulsory education opposed, which means the education of the whole people, and so their general equality and independence. Universal education means revolt. The task of controlling the people is rendered harder by their education.

The parochial schools, even now, do not contemplate universal education. Only the few are trained there. The poor are induced to train their children for trades or daily labor. "Paddy needs a hoe, not an education," said an archbishop. Free education is not the policy of parochial schools, and did not the public schools gather in the poor, the church would not fight for them. Only in self-defense does it require attendance at parochial schools, or rather absence from public schools; for none are anathematized who patronize no schools at all.

Did the church take arms against the saloons, an acknowledged evil, it would render a colossal service to the country as well as to itself; for Catholic youths are there ruined by thousands. The saloons, however, tend to promote the subjection of the people, rather than their independence. Brains

that are muddled are not so liable to revolt as those that are clear. Dull minds are less dangerous than active ones. The Catholic Church has not issued orders to remove its youth from the saloons as it has from the public schools, though many get their chief training there. It has not provided a substitute for saloons, as it has for schools, or sought to abolish them as it has the latter. It has not advocated parochial control in drinking matters. Catholics are rarely prohibitionists or high-license men. They favor free saloons, though opposed to free schools, being the champions of a vice as enthusiastically as they are the opponents of a virtue. Universal drinking is thought less damaging to Catholicism than universal education. A nation of drunkards might be an obedient people, but not a nation of educated men. The dread of Catholicism is not degradation, but insubordination.

The attitude of Catholics toward their masters, especially the highest, may introduce several serious disturbances in our nation. The pope, for example, is to be believed and followed in all he says and commands for this country. The fact that his followers believe he can never say or command anything but what is right makes it impossible for them to consider whether it is wrong. For while they say they will follow him only when right, they say also that he never does anything else than what is right.

Catholics claim, indeed, that the pope will not unduly interfere in our national affairs. But the very fact that they believe he will not unduly interfere, makes them believe, when he does interfere, that such interference is not undue. Believing in the unfailing wisdom of the pope, they cannot but approve whatever he does. A mistake is never conceded to one believed incapable of making a mistake; so that the very fact that the pope or church takes sides in our politics is con-

clusive proof that the occasion for it has arisen. There is no subject on which the "rights of the church," for example, may not be thought involved, or something affecting faith or morals; so that there is no subject on which the church may not properly interfere.

This introduces a foreign element into our politics. The Catholic Church is controlled by foreigners, and mainly by those of one country. These foreigners are among the least progressive in Europe, and are the most reactionary of their own nation. American politics, therefore, wherein controlled by the Catholic Church, is controlled by the most backward element of the Italians. This is unnatural, and must produce serious friction. Millions of our citizens who feel it wrong to rule are subjected to the inhabitants of a country far inferior in intelligence and general ability. A large proportion of Americans are thus taken out of politics to be replaced by foreigners at Rome, or else remain here to do the bidding of their foreign masters.

It is futile to hope there will be no trouble from foreign interference on this subject. The points are many on which Catholics clash with other Americans. One is the right itself of the state to educate. Catholics claim this right for parents, alleging that the public school system is founded on a wrong — on the invasion of the rights of the people. Education is thought to be a private right, which the state should leave to the parent. In its dealings with the parent, however, the church next claims this right for the church.* So the Catholic policy is, by two steps, to take education from the state and give it to the church. By the first it takes it from the state, by the next it lodges it in the church. The fight is made in the name of "liberty" — "liberty of the individual," of "the parent," or of "the Christian." Only when it seeks

to take away the right from the individual does it assert the right of the church or pope. Parents alone, it says (in politics), are responsible for the education of their children. Parents, however, it says (in religion), have no rights as against the church. The church alone is entitled to direct education. It is accordingly, in the final result, a contest between the right of the state and the right of the church to educate.

The foreigners whose jurisdiction is acknowledged by Catholics are thus enabled through them to obtain from the United States, and from the several States, much of their power, so that we are getting a divided government. Catholics owe a double allegiance—to the United States and to the ecclesiastical power at Rome, the latter being deemed superior. They are engaged in a long and determined struggle to get more power for their foreign master; and the school is to be the principal prize sought in the interest of their Roman superiors.

The principal issue on which Catholics antagonize our schools is their unsectarian character. The Roman policy is church schools, and Catholics are directed to antagonize all others, and, as this will be a great issue, the superiority and infallibility ascribed to the church and pope must have a great influence in our politics. Claiming that non-sectarian schools are non-religious schools, or “godless schools,” they insist on having religion taught in the schools, and that the religion taught shall be their religion. They know that this is impracticable; so that, if their purpose prevail, either the public schools must go or Catholics must be set apart in schools of their own, with a share of the public money. This amounts to having the state support Catholic schools, that is, to having the state give Catholic instruction, or pay for it. The state must either teach Catholicism or employ Catholics to do so.

This scheme would tax the whole people for a church, and let the church spend the money. It contemplates, to that extent, a union of church and state, which would in the end destroy our political system.

This position of Catholics is one of the greatest dangers that threaten our nation. It involves the official division of our people in religion, and a treatment of them according to belief. It implies that Catholics be set apart and subsidized as Catholics, and that they be educated and employed as such. Guarantees are to be given that their religion shall not be disturbed. Catholics alone must have employment in certain public offices. Foreign tribunals must be recognized as authority in settling what constitutes Catholicism. The church at Rome — the pope — must thus have the final decision in matters of dispute affecting part of our public schools, and (ultimately) of other institutions. There is, in short, to be a union of civil and ecclesiastical power which would be fatal to our republican system.

There is no complication that might not arise should we open the door to any union whatever of this church with our government; and yet such union is persistently sought as the only logical result of the Catholic position; and American Catholics must contend for it, no matter how they love our institutions. For, having conceded to others the right to guide them in these matters, and having ascribed to them infallibility, they can consistently do nothing else than be guided by them.

The schools, however, are not the only subject on which submission to foreign dictation produces friction. Catholics want other church institutions subsidized, or else themselves exempted from taxation. In nearly every State they seek appropriations for hospitals or reformatories. They com-

mence by getting part of the paupers, insane, blind, and especially orphans, and then ask the state for appropriations for keeping them. They profess dissatisfaction with the state institutions because they do not provide Catholic training, and so establish institutions of their own, with the ulterior objects mentioned. The state is asked to disparage its own institutions for rival ones, and so declare itself as incompetent to care for its citizens. Catholics want the church recognized as a competitor of the state in public charities, and many institutions are organized with no other object than ultimately to obtain funds from the public treasury. A show is made of doing the state a service by keeping its unfortunates, which is only the first step. Compensation is next asked for this service, and great sums are annually demanded for what was commenced as a charity.

To ask, in view of these advantages, special privileges from the state in order to get still greater gains is not to undertake a benevolence. Catholics in insisting on favors as Catholics in these matters attack the very basis of our political system. They are out with the government more than any other class, and insist on having their disaffection not only recognized but rewarded. Wherein they do not approve of the state's conduct they want the state to pay for their dissent.

Catholics thus insist on a public recognition of the religious differences of our people, and their treatment according to such differences; and in doing this they want especially the recognition of the foreign power mentioned as the authority that controls them. They want this government to recognize Rome as the sovereign of a part of its citizens, and to treat such citizens as Roman subjects entitled to rights different from those of American subjects. A great part of the government functions they seek to take from the government and

lodge in the church, as we have seen. Wanting the church to rule them, they want, to that extent, the state to release them. The state not only must not teach and care for Catholics in such places, but must not tax Catholics for such purposes. The church should be allowed to levy such taxes; and what Catholics have to pay they want to be allowed to pay to the church.

I have thus aimed to present the attitude of the Catholic Church to the political and scientific problems of the day — its relation to our government and to the progress of the world.

I have not considered the benefits which it confers on the country or world in other respects, which is not pertinent to my subject. I may state, however, that by standing in the way of radical changes, the church heads off some movements of doubtful value; by criticizing scientific investigators, it compels them to be more careful; by opposing Socialism, it is a breakwater against dangers of an anarchistic or revolutionary character, and by controlling workingmen, who largely compose its ranks, it diminishes labor riots. Its attitude on divorce prevents many ruptures in families, and its confessional, by disclosing incipient crimes, defeats their consummation. As many will not commit sins when they must disclose them, it promotes morality in various ways. This infallible church does not always err. It would not be human if it did not generally give good advice, and do much to enforce it. Where the church's interests do not intervene, Catholics are exceptionally patriotic. There is no occasion to discriminate against them any more than in their favor, which would equally violate the principle of equality.

ARTICLE V.

THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS CONCERNING
JESUS.

BY HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, otherwise known as Joseph ben Matthias, was born about seven years after the crucifixion of Christ. He did not survive his sixty-third year apparently, for he died not far from 100 A.D., possibly by violence, soon after or near the close of the reign of Domitian. Of priestly descent and related to the Maccabees, he was intimately acquainted with Jewish traditions and beliefs, but he was also an admirer, and seemingly an honest one, of Rome and her institutions. Loyalty to his own people led him to oppose the Roman power, however, until he sustained a crushing defeat at the hands of Vespasian. Accepting the inevitable, he then went over to the standard of his conqueror and remained faithful to the end.

His youth was spent in Jerusalem, so far as is known, but at the age of twenty-six he went to Rome and remained there for a time. He returned deeply impressed by what he had seen, but still loyally Jewish. Soon after this he was intrusted with important missions in Galilee by the authorities at Jerusalem, with whom he seems to have been on intimate terms, and he thus became familiar with all the peculiarities of that turbulent province. His experiences there were many and varied, and he had ample time and opportunity to learn all that was to be known of the region and its people.

His later years were devoted to writing, and his histories are remarkable both for their fullness of detail and for their comprehensiveness. They form, indeed, the most important source of information concerning his times that the world now possesses. Personally, he appears to have been by nature deeply religious; and one of the reasons which he gives for undertaking a history at all, is the habitual perversion of the truth concerning these things, displayed by others in their writings. He thus binds himself in advance to be fair and accurate in his statements, and he professes to have set forth the facts without bias in all that he has to say. He even asks indulgence for such lamentations over the misfortunes of his people as he has admitted into his account of the wars, on the ground that those parts of his work are to be regarded as personal rather than as historical elements.

In his "Antiquities of the Jews" he has this to say concerning Jesus:—

"Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, — a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day" (*Antiq.* xviii. 3. 3).

Coming from a Jew, this is certainly a remarkable statement. And yet, if he lived up to his avowed purpose of telling the exact truth concerning Jewish affairs without addition or omission, it is the least that he was able to say in view of the facts. That he had such a purpose and fully intended to

live up to it cannot be doubted, if his own statements have any weight, since he definitely says:—

"As I proceed therefore, I shall accurately describe what is contained in our records, in the order of time that belongs to them; for I have already promised so to do throughout this undertaking; and this without adding anything to what is therein contained, or taking away anything therefrom" (*Antiq.*, Preface, 3).

That the Jewish records contained some reference to Jesus cannot be questioned; for the trial and condemnation by the Sanhedrim necessitated such an outcome. The execution by Pontius Pilate, moreover, to which Tacitus bears witness (*Annals* xv. 44), was of sufficient importance to demand recognition in the public documents. In addition to these things, there was the persistent tale that he had risen from the dead, which had to be faced and explained away (see *Matt.* xxviii. 11-15).

That no notice was taken of these events in the official records of the Jews is beyond belief, and these writings were unquestionably consulted by Josephus in the course of his investigations. Furthermore, that he could not fail to be conversant with the facts, will be denied by no one, since they must have been matters of common remark in his boyhood, if not later; and an active youth with such a mind as his can always be trusted to listen to and retain in memory anything that he hears which is out of the ordinary. That the story of the crucifixion and resurrection fulfils the required conditions may be regarded as self-evident.

Again, for at least twenty-five years after the latter event, or until Josephus was near the end of his "teens," the activities of the native Christian church in Jerusalem, combined with the pronounced and, at times, deadly hostility of the Jewish authorities to its very existence, must have furnished

abundant material for remark among the members of a proverbially excitable race; and it is simply inconceivable that Josephus had no part therein. His natural fairness of mind and his disposition to balance probabilities in an effort to get at the truth would naturally lead him to inquire into the matter and get the story of the disciples as well as that of the officials; and his desire to be impartial must have influenced his opinion concerning these affairs, as it certainly did concerning others. That he knew of all these events, therefore, cannot be questioned. No intelligent person could live in Jerusalem or in Galilee and remain in ignorance of these things, and he lived in both.

But this is not all, for, while he says nothing of studying so unpopular a belief as Christianity then was, he does tell of studying not only the sect of the Pharisees but also those of the Sadducees and the Essenes, and, not content with this, he actually went into the wilderness to become the disciple of an ascetic. Of these things, he says:—

"And when I was about sixteen years old, I had a mind to make trial of the several sects that were among us. . . . I thought that by this means I might choose the best, if I were once acquainted with them all; so I contented myself with hard fare, and underwent great difficulties, and went through them all. Nor did I content myself with these trials only; but when I was informed that one, whose name was Banus, lived in the desert, and used no other clothing than grew upon trees, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently, I imitated him in those things. . . . So when I had accomplished my desires, I returned back to the city, being now nineteen years old, and began to conduct myself according to the rules of the sect of the Pharisees, which is of kin to the sect of the Stoics, as the Greeks call them" (*Life*, 2).

His last teacher, then, seems to have been an imitator of John the Baptist, if not actually his disciple; and it is therefore not

to be wondered at that Josephus betrays an intimate acquaintance with the life of John, although he ignores some phases of his preaching. He was practically compelled to ignore them, as a matter of fact, because of the limitations of his work; but that he had not looked into them, and into their relation to the life of Jesus, is altogether improbable, in view of his known disposition and character. After trying all these other sects, he would not be likely to ignore entirely the existence and teachings of the followers of Christ, although policy might influence him to avoid doctrinal beliefs.

He chronicles the fact (*Antiq.* xviii. 5. 2) that "some of the Jews" regarded the destruction of Herod's army by Aretas as a judgment from God sent upon him as a punishment for beheading John the Baptist, and he also makes it clear that the better class of citizens condemned the action of the high priest in assembling the Sanhedrim and sentencing James to death. He says of him:—

"so he [the high priest] assembled the sanhedrim of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others. And when he had formed an accusation against them as breakers of the law, he delivered them to be stoned" (*Antiq.* xx. 9. 1).

He relates with evident satisfaction that the high priest was deposed as a result of the affair, and he speaks of him as a "bold man in his temper, and very insolent." Now, whatever else these facts may show, they cannot be said to disclose any suggestion of a bitter hostility either towards Christ himself or towards his followers. In fact, they almost appear to indicate a feeling quite the opposite of this, and Josephus lacks but little of seeming to be among the almost persuaded. To claim that he was, would be going too far; but it is not too much to say that he tried to be fair and to tell all the facts.

In concluding his "Antiquities," he makes this emphatic statement:—

"And I am so bold as to say, now I have so completely perfected the work I proposed to myself to do, that no other person, whether he were a Jew or a foreigner, had he ever so great an inclination to it, could so accurately deliver these accounts to the Greeks, as is done in these books. For those of my own nation freely acknowledge, that I far exceed them in the learning belonging to Jews; I have also taken a great deal of pains to obtain the learning of the Greeks, and understand the elements of the Greek language" (*Antiq.* **xx.** 11. 2).

He adds in the next paragraph, that "there are still living such as can either prove what I say to be false, or can attest that it is true." Is it likely that he would be ignorant of, or purposely avoid mentioning, the crucifixion of Christ; and, if he did mention it, would he be likely to say nothing of the resurrection? But, supposing he were not personally convinced of the truth of the story, would he not have been sure to chronicle the fact that "some of the Jews" claimed that Jesus rose from the dead?

The pertinency of these questions will be recognized, when it is remembered that the passage quoted above concerning Jesus has long been regarded as a forgery. Writing in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" Dean Farrar says: —

"That Josephus wrote the whole passage as it now stands no sane critic can believe. Vespasian, not Jesus, was the Messiah of the 'ambiguous oracle' of that apostate Jew. There are, however, two reasons which are alone sufficient to prove that the whole passage is spurious,—one that it was unknown to Origen and the earlier fathers, the other that its place in the text is uncertain. It is now found after the historian's notices of Pilate, but the remarks of Eusebius show that in his time it was found before them. We must conclude then that Josephus preserved a politic silence respecting Christ and the Christians, . . . and this was quite possible, because he was writing mainly for Greeks and Romans who were profoundly ignorant of the whole subject" (ninth ed., vol. xlii. p. 658).

He adds that it is evident that "Josephus knew a great deal more than he chose to say." Of the statement concerning James he says:—

"The passage was early tampered with by Christian interpolators who wished to make it a more emphatic testimony in favor of Christ, but in its present form its genuineness is undisputed" (*l. c.*).

But if this passage is genuine, it is pertinent to ask why he speaks in such a familiar way of "Jesus, who was called Christ." Was he so well known that that was sufficient? And if not, is it not clear that Josephus himself had already explained the matter in such a way that this later reference was a natural one? But, again, if he was so well known, would Josephus be likely to omit an account of him from his writings? And if the Greeks and Romans, for whom he mainly wrote, "were profoundly ignorant of the whole subject," was it in keeping for Josephus to speak in this matter-of-fact way of "Jesus, who was called Christ," unless he had himself previously explained who Jesus was?

It will not do to presume too much on the ignorance of the Greeks and Romans, because Tacitus, as was stated above, makes mention of the crucifixion. Incidentally, he berates the Christians as "a class hated for their abominations," and he calls their belief "a most mischievous superstition." He bears emphatic witness, however, to the fact that it spread with increasing vigor even to Rome soon after the death of Christ. Verily, these things were not done in a corner, and the world did not escape taking cognizance of them. The resurrection was everywhere proclaimed with vigor by Paul and his coworkers, and the whole early church bore witness to it, not only by word of mouth but also by their methods of worship.

As Tacitus died in the early part of the second century, and apparently had no personal knowledge of Judea, it is plain that Josephus had a far better opportunity than he did to learn the facts, which were already, at the time the "Annals" were written, matters of common knowledge. Tacitus did not deign to consider the story of a resurrection; but Josephus could not so readily dodge the claim. Writing, as he did for men not of his own race, and men who were not so excitable and were therefore not so liable to visit their wrath upon his head for doing it, he might easily have voiced his own conviction that the resurrection was a fact, and then explained it by the sacred writings. He could do this and still believe that Vespasian was the Messiah, because he would not really be inconsistent from a Jewish standpoint, even if he went as far as that.

Just here it should be said that there is no field in which scholars have been so much at fault as that which affects viewpoint. Instead of leaving no stone unturned in the effort to get at the true meaning of an author, they judge too often by outward appearance, and reach wrong conclusions by doing so. This is apparent even in the last revision of the New Testament. The true rendering of Luke viii. 14 is not "pleasures of this life," but 'pleasures of their way of living,' and 2 Timothy ii. 4 is similar; for the same Greek word is used with the meaning, 'entangleth himself with the affairs of his way of living,' or, in other words, he no longer attempts to attend to his own personal matters and he does not try to live as he did at home. It is just here that the first test of a soldier is apt to come; and, if war is not to be placed among the "affairs of this life," it is hard to tell where to classify it. It certainly does not belong in heaven, whatever may be said of some other place, or rather state.

The Messiah was to be a king. That was universally conceded. But there were other prophecies in direct conflict with this, and the Jewish rabbis have had to explain them. They have sometimes done so by postulating a second quasi-Messiah, who was to die as a scapegoat, and fulfil the requirements of a number of passages which would otherwise be, to them, inexplicable. To us, since we understand the true meaning of the word "kingdom," as it is used in the Messianic passages, the whole thing is simple enough, and we need no help in understanding it; but to put Josephus into our shoes and to imagine that we can judge him by our standards is something more than merely an unfair proceeding. It is positively unscientific.

Even a good translation cannot be made from the standpoint of the translator. He who undertakes such a task must divest himself, as far as possible, of his own personality, and put himself in the place of the man he seeks to interpret. Otherwise he cannot reproduce his author's meaning with any degree of certainty. Few observe this requirement, however, and the fact is constantly made evident. The word "amazement" (A. V. "amazed") represents the ordinary Greek word for astonishment in Luke iv. 36; but in v. 28 it is allowed to stand for an entirely different term, which is the etymological equivalent of the English word "ecstasy." The difference deserves recognition. In the latter passage, a strange exaltation, a something that lifted them out of themselves, was what is referred to, while in the earlier chapter it was merely a natural astonishment.

Eventually, the notes that are found in school and college text-books will not show this lack of vision. At present, they do so altogether too often. In like manner, remarks on construction not infrequently suggest a pair of linguistic spectacles,

of a decidedly modern pattern, perched securely on the nose of the editor; and it is sometimes apparent that the lenses are of sufficient strength to warp his vision seriously. In other words, the grammatical relations found in his own language are allowed to modify or even reverse those which the arrangement of the words in the original tongue would naturally demand. The trouble is caused by a neglect of native idioms, as such, a study of which is absolutely necessary, if the translator is to have any true *Sprachgefühl* for his author's linguistic forms. He must get a new pair of spectacles, if not a new brain, in order to do his subject proper justice, and so must a critic.

It cannot be claimed that Canon Farrar and his fellow critics did these things. Modern ways of thinking were allowed entirely too much influence in their conclusions to make that possible, and they actually assumed that it was allowable to judge Josephus as if he were a product of nineteenth-century conditions in a Christian country instead of the result of Jewish and Roman influences at the very beginning of our era. Josephus could not look back, as we can, and his vision must have been poor and nebulous on the whole Messianic question. This should be self-evident, but it has not even been considered, to all appearance, since we must at once modify our whole conception of his position, if we give this phase of the matter any sort of attention. What did he know of our Messiah? Nay, what does the modern Jew know of him? Isaiah is practically tabooed by Hebrew rabbis, because it has become a belief and almost a proverb that too much study of the prophet will result in making a "turncoat," or *meshummad*. The Jew has no place even now for the Christian conception of the Messiah, and he wants none. How, then, is Josephus to be placed in such a category?

He found an "ambiguous oracle," which he could not possibly comprehend. Of it, he says:—

"But now, what did the most elevate them in undertaking this war, was an ambiguous oracle that was found also in their sacred writings, how, 'about that time one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth.' The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of the wise men were thereby deceived in their determination. Now, this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor in Judea. However, it is not possible for men to avoid fate, although they see it beforehand" (Wars, vi. 5. 4).

The oracle itself was plainly something outside of the Scriptures, although it was confirmed by them, and this fact is important. It foreshadowed a universal king; and, to his mind, Vespasian was such an one. He therefore concluded, with the same undue haste that is so often in evidence in the work of modern critics, that Vespasian fulfilled the oracle. He says nothing about a Messiah or anointed one, at all; and the fact that this king was to be an "anointed one," according to the Scriptures, probably meant little or nothing to him, since the term itself was a more or less familiar one. It was used of Saul by David (1 Sam. xxiv. 6), when he spoke of him as the "anointed of Jehovah"; it was employed in connection with others, as, for instance, the patriarchs (Ps. cv. 15); and even Cyrus himself was so designated (Isa. xlv. 1).

With these usages, Josephus must have been perfectly familiar, and it is manifestly absurd to pin him down to the modern Christian conception of a single "anointed one," who is *the* Messiah. It would be strange indeed if no progress had been made in eighteen centuries in the interpretation of scriptural teachings concerning the Saviour. Josephus could not comprehend—the Jew has never been able to do so—that the Scriptures had reference to a spiritual kingdom, a king-

dom within men, and not to the pomp and circumstance of external rule. He therefore thought as he did, and, for him, no other course was possible. But there were other scriptural prophecies which seemed to be clearly fulfilled by Jesus. He must have known them; for he was beyond question familiar with Isaiah. He could not have been ignorant of Jesus and his life; and, with the same freedom and directness that he had manifested in reference to Vespasian, he accepted the conclusion that Jesus was the person referred to by the sacred writings. This, at least, is what the facts seem to indicate.

To him, Vespasian was a royal "anointed one," or a Messianic king of vast and unlimited sway. He was therefore the ruler that was to be. Jesus, on the other hand, had nothing royal about him; but he was apparently another "anointed one," sent to fulfil other prophecies which, in effect, were the exact opposite of those relating to the kingdom. That both should be fulfilled by one person was beyond his ken; for he could not possibly conceive of such a thing, and there was therefore no inconsistency in his choice of two persons in this connection. Simple fairness demands that this be recognized; for Josephus cannot be judged by our standards unless he also possessed our knowledge. To claim that he did so would be sufficiently preposterous to bring its own refutation, and the point needs no elucidation.

If he mentioned Jesus as Christ, he did not use Christ as a proper name; for he simply accepted the epithet of the people in the Greek vernacular, which made him an "anointed one," or *Christos*. He did not thereby subscribe to our belief, because he did not even know what our belief includes. He could not, unless he was a closer student of New Testament teachings than any one has ever been willing to admit. This particular Jesus was the one called *Christos*, and the meaning of the

word itself seems at times to require the article before it. To omit it would be somewhat like omitting "the" in such forms as Peter the Hermit. As Josephus deals with various other persons of the same name, he has followed the most easy method of distinguishing this one. No other course would have been as natural or as effective, and Josephus was trying to state facts as he saw them, from a standpoint that was almost as much Roman as it was Jewish. He mentions, under the name Jesus, the son of Ananus (Wars, vi. 5. 3), the son of Damneus (Antiq. xx. 9. 1, 4), the son of Gamala (Life, 38), the son of Gamaliel (Antiq. xx. 9. 4; Wars, iv. 4. 3, 5. 2), the son of Saphat (Life, 22; Wars, iii. 9. 7), the son of Sapphias (Life, 12, 27; Wars, ii. 20. 4), the son of Phabet (Antiq. xv. 9. 3), the brother of Onias (Antiq. xii. 5. 1; xv. 3. 1), and the son of Thebuthus (Wars, vi. 8. 3). In each instance, he is as explicit in his identification as there is any need of being, and, where there is any occasion for doing so, he gives details of the man's life, character, and occupation. Did he say nothing about Jesus the Anointed One?

It must now be evident that the argument based on the Messianic beliefs of Josephus is no argument at all. His idea of the meaning and the scope of prophecies that were just beginning to be fulfilled in his day can no more be compared to our own conception of these things, with eighteen centuries of growth in clarity of vision, to say nothing of experience, than the idle guesses of a boy of twelve can be compared to the deliberate judgment of a man of mature years. We forget that each generation inherits the wealth of its predecessors in other things than mere worldly goods, but the fact remains, and sooner or later it must be included in all our premises if we have a due regard for the truth.

The question is not yet settled, however, since two other indictments are still to be considered. It was alleged in the quotation given above that the passage was unknown to Origen and the earlier church fathers, and that the remarks of Eusebius place it before the historian's notices of Pilate, instead of after them, where it now appears. Origen is supposed to have died in A.D. 253, while Eusebius is said to have been born eleven years later, in 264 A.D.; and it therefore follows, if this passage is really a Christian interpolation and a forgery, that within a space of not over fifty years, by some means difficult to imagine, Christian literary rogues were clever enough to get the paragraph into the original text without raising a howl of protest from the enemies of their beliefs, and that they were also clever enough to cover their tracks so completely that the fact was not discovered, until the superior acumen of modern critics dragged it forth into the light. Does this seem probable on its face?

Was it possible, as a matter of fact? Could the thing have been done? Is human ingenuity equal to such a task? Would Eusebius himself have been able to begin it even, by pretending that the passage was there? Could any one have secured its insertion in that, or in any other way? And if the thing was done at all, why have we no record of it? Were all the outstanding MSS. gathered up and destroyed by the Christian plotters after they had furnished duplicates with the passage interpolated as we now find it? And if this was not done, why did no one ever discover the fraud at the time of its perpetration? But, suppose that it had been actually possible to commit such a forgery, would there have been no one with a memory of the earlier text? Assuredly, our modern critics, clever as they are, must yield the palm to these early gentlemen, who could deceive their own generation and so many

later ones in this matter, besides hypnotizing into silence or forgetfulness any and every stray scholar who might otherwise have betrayed them. After quoting at length from Josephus, Eusebius says, of the passage in question:—

ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου διελθὼν καὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ συγγράμματος ἱστορίαν ὡς πῶς μέμνηται “ γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἴ γε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρὴ· ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητὴς, διδάσκαλος ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἡδονῇ τάλληθι δεχομένων, καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. 8. ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν. καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ’ ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτιμηκός τις Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο οἱ τὸ πρώτον ἀγαπήσαντες. ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν, τῶν θείων προφητῶν ταῦτά τε καὶ ἄλλα μυρία περὶ αὐτοῦ θαυμάσια εἰρηκότων. εἰσέτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὀνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φύλον ” (H. E. i. 11. 7f.).

McGiffert omits the most important sentence and renders:—

“After relating these things concerning John, he makes mention of our Savior in the same work, in the following words: ‘And there lived at that time Jesus, a wise man, if indeed, it be proper to call him a man. For he was a doer of wonderful works, and a teacher of such men as receive the truth in gladness. And he attached to himself many of the Jews, and many also of the Greeks. He was the Christ. When Pilate, on the accusation of our principal men, condemned him to the cross, those who had loved him in the beginning did not cease loving him. [Why not?] Moreover, the race of Christians, named after him, continues down to the present day.’”

It will be seen that this corresponds very closely with the English version of the passage in Josephus, as it was quoted from Whiston at the beginning of this article. A careful comparison with an ancient text of the original disclosed only such slight verbal variations as are wont to be found in all such cases. Josephus seems to have said ‘many Jews’ instead of ‘many of the Jews,’ Eusebius has ‘many from the Greeks,’ with an inserted *apo*, there is another variation in connection with an article in the phrase translated ‘those who loved him

at the first, and the phrase *peri autou* follows *thaumasia* in Josephus instead of preceding it. If no such variations were found, it might be argued that the passage in Josephus was a forgery by the hand of Eusebius, if such a thing is conceivable; but the fact that they are found is a strong presumptive argument in favor of the genuineness of the original paragraph. The alterations are exactly such as are commonly made in quoting from memory, and that was the universal habit within certain limits in earlier times; for accuracy of quotation hardly antedates the year 1840 as a regular practice, and accuracy of definition has the same limitations.

The passage quoted by Eusebius concerning John, which he here refers to, passes unquestioned; but he quotes this one immediately with the same assurance and with the same assumption of its familiarity to the readers of the historian. How could he do this, if there was the least suspicion of its genuineness? And how could there be no such suspicion, if the passage itself had not been in existence over fifty years? If the supposition that Josephus did write the paragraph has produced a *crux* for the critics, what shall be said of the contention that he did not write it? Has that produced no *crux* at all for the rank and file whose common sense demands satisfaction even at the hands of superior beings with a gift of second sight that enables them to discover things hidden from less-favored mortals? And if the thing explained actually involves less difficulty than the explanation by which it is removed, is the last state better than the first?

Again, what proof is there that the passage was unknown to Origen? Does the bare fact that he did not quote it establish his ignorance of the paragraph? Is there no possibility that he did not regard it as of sufficient importance to incorporate in his work? And is there no chance for the supposi-

tion that he may have simply overlooked it in his argument because of other things? Did no modern critic ever realize when his work was done that he had inadvertently omitted something which would have been of service in developing his thesis if he had not passed it over because of its very familiarity? Are human limitations confined to modern men in this particular? Was it impossible for an ancient father in the church to omit something that he had no intention of passing by when he began his dissertation? These factors must be disposed of before it will be at all safe to argue, from the omission of a statement, that any given author was incapable of making it, and Origen does not lie outside the pale of this contention. Whether he knew the paragraph or not, no man can say with certainty; but the chances are that he did, though he did not happen to make use of it.

But there is more to be said concerning the matter of quotations; for it must not be supposed that everything was quoted from memory in olden times. Long and unfamiliar passages were undoubtedly copied from the original with some degree of care; but things that were familiar and fairly brief were never dignified by such a treatment. The ancient scholar's notebook was his brain, and he used it as the modern student does his written page. This fact seems to have escaped the critics in some unknown way; but it must be reckoned with nevertheless, if our views are to conform to actualities. To put an ancient scholar into modern harness in his work is an anachronism, if it is nothing more; but the thing is constantly done in articles that pass for authoritative statements of fact. What has become of our perspective?

That Eusebius actually quoted from memory in this instance, is made clear by his words of introduction. 'About as follows,' is what he says, and the meaning cannot be avoided.

He was not copying from a written page. It was his memory that he was depending on, and this fact in itself shows how familiar the passage was to him. Such forms of introduction were common enough in treatises of various kinds, as must be remembered by those who have made use of the grammarians, and they are significant. The passage was so well known that he could quote it thus with safety and incur no risk of misleading any one. Others knew it too, and they would recall it, just as he had done. His whole attitude, in short, bespeaks the use of an unquestioned and authoritative historical statement which his readers would readily accept at its face value.

As to the question of order, little need be said. If accuracy of quotation is a modern virtue, as has been suggested already (this has long been taught by one of the foremost of American linguists), it follows that when men put things down as they came to mind there must have been some variations in the order of the statements involved. It was accordingly the easiest thing in the world for Eusebius to recall the paragraphs with the order inverted, if he really did any such thing; for the argument from the order is at best only an inference. Errors of this kind, however, are extremely common in quotations from memory; for some men instinctively invert things and others occasionally do so without being aware of it at the time. If Eusebius did invert the order and the fact has any significance at all, it merely implies that he had grown somewhat careless about the exact words and their arrangement because of their great familiarity, and he did not stop to consider the matter with diligence. The expression "mess of pottage" is not in the Scriptures; but most persons would accept it as being there simply because it is so familiar in connection with Jacob and Esau. Quicksands of this type do

not afford good foundations for elaborate structures, and it is just as well not to build on them.

But Eusebius also quotes the other passage, and it may be well to cite his version of it:—

“καθίζει συνέδριον κριτῶν, καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λεγομένου, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ τινες ἑτέροις, ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος παρέδωκε λευσθησόμενους” (ib. ii. 23. 22).

Including the subject, McGiffert's rendering is:—

“Ananas, . . . called together the Sanhedrim, and brought before them the brother of Jesus, the so-called Christ, James by name, together with some others, and accused them of violating the law, and condemned them to be stoned.”

The text of Josephus mentioned above has a slight difference in the order of the words which implies the meaning ‘the so-called *Christos*,’ or ‘the so-called Anointed-one,’ instead of ‘the one called Christ,’ and, in all probability, the meaning of the other passage is similar. ‘He was the Anointed-one, the one so known,’ was what Josephus intended to say, not ‘he was the Christ,’ in the modern Christian sense. Such over-translations are common; but they are not accurate, and they should not be accepted. Language has content as well as form, and the content of a given word or phrase is the important thing, although its form is what is commonly considered. Meaning alone should be the goal of the investigator. It is the only genuine intellectual coin. All else is spurious.

Again, just preceding this quotation Eusebius has another, in which he says:—

ἀμέλει γέ τοι καὶ ὁ Ἰώσηπος οὐκ ἀπώκνησε καὶ τοῦτ' ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτύρασθαι δι' ὧν φησι λέξεων “ταῦτα δὲ συνβέβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκρισιν Ἰακώβου τοῦ δικαίου, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, ἐπειδήπερ δικαιοτάτον αὐτὸν ὄντα οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπέκτειναν” (l. c. 20).

As rendered by McGiffert, this last passage reads:—

“Josephus, at least, has not hesitated to testify this in his writings, where he says, ‘These things happened to the Jews to avenge James the Just, who was a brother of Jesus, that is called the Christ. For the Jews slew him, although he was a most just man.’”

Just where Eusebius found this statement is not clear; but it is entirely in keeping with the other passages and is in the style of the historian. It is therefore probably genuine. That, at least, is the presumption, and the burden of proof lies with those who would reject it. There is certainly no need of jumping to the conclusion that this shows an attempt to tamper with the passage, on the part of “Christian interpolators who wished to make it a more emphatic testimony in favor of Christ”; for it is quite as easy to account for such an omission in modern MSS. as it is to explain an insertion of that character in ancient ones, even as a marginal reading. The order of the words respecting Jesus is that which Josephus uses elsewhere, and the sentiments expressed plainly tally with his other teachings. If the statement actually did originate in some MS. from a marginal reading, it may have been an insertion from the historian’s own hand, added in some other connection as an afterthought. It has all the earmarks of a genuine quotation, and as such it should be received, until proof to the contrary is forthcoming. If it was due to the hand of a scribe, it was a reminiscence of other familiar teachings of the historian. If it was, on the other hand, a part of the original text, its omission, in some MS. and its later transcriptions, probably occurred in the usual way by a slip on the part of the scribe, as his eye returned to the page he was copying.

But if the presumption in favor of the genuineness of this brief statement is fairly strong, it is as nothing compared with

that in favor of the genuineness of the paragraph concerning Jesus himself. When the general hostility of the entire gentile and Hebrew world to all things Christian is remembered, it is little short of marvelous that the entire passage concerning Jesus is found in all the extant MSS. of Josephus. If there was the slightest doubt, moreover, in the days of Eusebius with regard to its genuineness, it is simply inconceivable that he should have quoted it twice as genuine, and especially that he should have used it in the second instance (Dem. Ev. iii. 3. 105, 106) in an effort to convince the Jews of the truths of the Gospel. The possibility of extirpating a passage of that kind from a MS. or MSS. in copying seems far greater than that of inserting it, and the unvarying character of the testimony found in the documents themselves presents an insurmountable obstacle to the supposition that the passage is a Christian forgery.

Josephus tried to tell facts. He agreed to tell all the facts. He promised to omit nothing. To rule out the paragraph in question is to say that he was not honest, that he did not keep his word, and that he purposely dodged this particular issue. It is, moreover, not in the least necessary to suppose that he was potentially a Christian at heart, in order to account for the presence of the passage in his works; for he was not propounding personal beliefs, and his own beliefs were not pertinent in the case beyond a simple question of fact. If he had evidence that seemed to him conclusive beyond reasonable doubt that Jesus rose from the dead, he had no alternative but to chronicle the event. He did so as briefly as possible and dropped the matter there. He apparently did not care to go further, even if he did recognize the miracle, and he may have regarded the Christian views as extreme. It was certainly not necessary that his own convictions should be won

over concerning scriptural doctrines and Christian claims. He was a historian, not a writer on dogma, and as such he must have acted in this matter. As such, he must also be judged, and it is manifestly improper to attack this question on any other basis, unless we can truthfully assume at the start that Josephus was dishonest. He was something of a partisan at times, but he would hardly have been human if he had not had this failing, and his traducers are in no position to throw stones on that score.

The presumptive argument, then, is in favor of the passage as it stands. There is, in fact, no basis for any other belief except the intellectual difficulties of men who use their own modern conception of the entire matter with too great freedom to see clearly what position Josephus really occupied. To understand him, we must put ourselves in his place and divest ourselves of all modern views and prejudices. This is not an easy thing to do; but it is a necessity if one is to be fair. He tried to be just that, and he did the best he could. This is sufficient to explain the whole difficulty, and with this we should be content.

Others have written on this passage in years past; but it has been impossible to take the time to consider anything but the presumptive side of the question, and none of their writings have been consulted. Most of them are now out of date, and the limits of such an article as this forbid any attempt to deal with that side of the question. If any such have considered the problem from the angle here employed, it is not known to the author, who has written simply as the conviction has been slowly forced upon him by a long consideration of the question on its merits alone.

ARTICLE VI.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE CONSERVATIVE TASK
IN PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW, LONDON.

II.

IN the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for January, 1911, the present writer discussed "Some Aspects of the Conservative Task in Pentateuchal Criticism." The object of the present paper is to consider these further in the light of what has occurred since that article was written. It cannot be contended that the conditions of the problem are unaltered or that no new light has been thrown on the duty of conservatives by what has happened in the interval.

It may first be observed that, whether we look at the lights or the shadows of the picture, conservatism has made progress. There is more and better conservative literature in the world than before. The emergence of Mr. J. S. Griffiths as a new conservative writer is a most cheering sign of the times. His excellent "Problem of Deuteronomy" is a welcome addition to the literature of the subject, and strengthens the position of conservatives throughout the English-speaking world. Dr. W. St. Clair Tisdall has published an admirable *brochure* entitled "Why I am Not a Higher Critic," which has been warmly received in more than one country. The *Jewish Quarterly Review*, formerly an organ of the higher criticism, has been converted to sane and sober views on biblical scholarship, and is now conducted with a learning and an ability that bid fair to make it one of the most valuable of theological

periodicals to all who are interested in Old Testament Studies: it is not the only periodical that has shown signs of turning from the higher critical vagaries. In Germany, too, indications of change from the fashionable hypothesis are not wanting. Pastor W. Möller has at last broken with the documentary theory; and though his book "*Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung*" may at first shock the delicate sensibilities of those who hold that orthodoxy consists in the unquestioning acceptance of a theory that makes the Pentateuch a cento of literary forgeries, it cannot in the long run fail to assist in shaking the position which that theory now occupies in the Universities of Northern Europe.¹ Here, too, mention should be made of Dr. Aage Schmidt's "*Gedanken über die Entwicklung der Religion auf Grund der babylonischen Quellen*,"² a monograph that is distinguished by the conservative results to which a comprehensive survey of the ancient evidence as to religious development has led the learned author.

The true weakness of conservatives does not lie in any inherent difficulties of the conservative case or in any faults of its champions. On the contrary, they possess the qualities that are necessary for the vindication of their views. They have the learning; they have the ability; more important than either, they have the strength of character. Unfortunately — and it is here that their whole difficulty lies — they have not the necessary organization, though in this respect they are rap-

¹ Since the above was written, a Dutch scholar, Dr. A. Troelstra, has published a brilliant and successful piece of work "*De Organische Eenheid van het Oude Testament*" (Leiden: A. L. Vlieger, 1912. It is an inaugural lecture delivered to the Leyden students. It must be hoped that it will soon appear in English dress. With Eerdmans and Troelstra both lecturing at the premier Dutch University, the prospects of the documentary theory in Holland are not of the rosiest.

² Leipzig, 1911.

idly improving. Not so very long ago the lack of inter-communication between the conservative scholars of various countries and creeds was extremely striking; and though there is a growing tendency to remedy this, the evil effects of the state of affairs that long prevailed have not yet passed away. The fault does not lie with the conservatives. It is due to the control exercised over almost the whole of the technical press in the various countries by the higher critics. Hereafter I shall have to speak of the darker aspects of the higher critical tactics, and it will be seen how that control must operate for the suppression of truth. Fortunately, as already stated, it is no longer so complete as formerly: and it cannot be doubted that, as conservatism obtains a hearing, the higher critical positions will be seen, by increasingly large numbers of people, to be untenable. The rate of progress made in the diffusion of sounder ideas is cumulative.

Side by side with these phenomena is the important fact that many lifelong critics are becoming exceedingly doubtful as to the soundness of their views. From the nature of the case one hears more of this in private than in public, for a critic who becomes doubtful as to his position tends to indulge in silent meditation, or private discussions with his friends, rather than to take the public into his confidence with respect to his mental perplexities. It must be admitted that the habit often has irritating tendencies. A man will write me that he is shaken on a particular point, but without making any public statement or modifying his published views. Then other people who know nothing of his private admissions will proceed to shout aloud about the assured results of modern criticism, in reliance on those very published views about which their author has begun to entertain doubts. That sort of thing is very annoying. But, in the case of the more honest critics, it

is merely a transition stage; for, sooner or later, they must give public expression to the change in their attitude.

Unfortunately, however, the limitation expressed in the phrase "in the case of the more honest critics" is a very narrow one.

In showing this it will be convenient to begin with the case of Dr. Charles Augustus Briggs. As stated in a footnote to the published correspondence with the general Editors of the *International Critical Commentary*,¹ I have waited to deal further with this, because I wished to give them an opportunity of exercising the right of further reply which they were so careful to reserve. I did this, although I realized at the time that they were indulging in what is popularly called bluff, and I have no doubt that anybody who will carefully and impartially examine the facts that I am about to quote will see that this was so.

Under date the 28th of February, 1911, Doctors Briggs and Driver wrote to me as follows: "We have both been familiar with the Septuagint for many years, and have compared large parts of it very minutely with the Massoretic text. As the result of this comparison we both hold that, where the two differ, the Massoretic text is to be preferred until the reading presupposed by the Septuagint has been shown to be superior to it, especially by yielding a sense in better agreement with the context or by being preferable upon philological or grammatical grounds. . . . In such expressions as these we have proposed no novel doctrine, but we only voice the general judgment of sober modern scholars. . . . We cannot, therefore, consistently with these principles, formed long ago, without any reference to the present controversy, admit that a variant reading presupposed either by all or by some MSS.

¹ See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1911, p. 324.

of the Septuagint, possesses any value as against the Massoretic text, or even casts doubt upon the Massoretic text until good cause has been shown for preferring it." These extracts contain the main reason for the inability of the general editors to discuss the scholarly part of my contentions, because, in truth and in fact, they are absolutely contradicted by the published writings of Dr. Briggs himself and of those whom the general editors have regarded as sufficiently sober modern scholars to be entrusted with the preparation of volumes of the International Critical Commentary.

First, as to Dr. Briggs himself: In the year 1899 he published a work entitled "General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture: The Principles, Methods, History, and Results of its Several Departments and of the Whole." The preface explains that in 1883 another volume had appeared, entitled "Biblical Study, its Principles, Methods, and History, together with a Catalogue of Books of Reference," and that the "General Introduction" is a new book incorporating the material of the earlier work, which in its turn had gathered up the work of the preceding fourteen years. Thus the "General Introduction" is the product of thirty years of work at the subjects with which it deals, and must be held to incorporate "principles formed long ago without any reference to the present controversy." It would be impossible to contradict the doctrines laid down in the joint letter more thoroughly than is done by Dr. Briggs in this work and in his Commentary on the Psalms.

The following extracts will give a pretty clear idea of his real position:—

"There can be no doubt that Rabbi Akiba and his associates at Jamnia not only fixed the Canon of the Old Testament, but also established the first official Hebrew text of the

Canon. There is a fixture in the consonantal text of Hebrew Manuscripts from the second century onwards, which can be accounted for only by the establishment at that time of such an official text. *This text was established in troublous times, when it was impossible to give the time and painstaking required for such an undertaking. There was no leisure to correct even the plainest mistakes. It was made by the comparison of a few manuscripts.* Tradition speaks of three, in cases of disagreement the majority of two always determining the correct reading”¹ (General Introduction, p. 175).

*“The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament lagged behind the New Testament. And the reason of it is, that scholars long hesitated to go back of the Massoretic text. . . . There can be no doubt, as Robertson Smith states: ‘It has gradually become clear to the vast majority of conscientious students that the Septuagint is really of the greatest value as a witness to the early state of the text’”*¹ (*op. cit.*, p. 229).

*“The study of the text of the Old Testament has been advanced in recent years by a great number of scholars in Germany, France, Switzerland, Holland, Austria, Italy, Great Britain, and America; scholars of all faiths, Jew and Christian, Roman Catholic and Protestant. They have vied with one another in this fundamental work of biblical study. It has now become practically impossible for any scholarly work to be done on the Old Testament without the use of all the resources of Textual Criticism for a sure foundation”*¹ (*op. cit.*, p. 230).

“The next step in Textual Criticism is to ascertain the original autographs of the Canon of the Law and the Prophets, when they were first collected and fixed. The Septuagint version of the Law and the Prophets, and possibly also of some

¹ *My italics.*

of the writings, takes us back of the Maccabean text”¹ (*op. cit.*, p. 238).

Dr. Briggs has, moreover, contributed to the International Critical Commentary, a work on the Psalter (dated 1906). The preface contains the following remarks that appear to be material to any consideration of the textual opinions expressed in the body of the work: “This commentary is the fruit of forty years of labour. . . . I have spared no pains upon the text of the Psalter, not only in the study of the Versions, but also in the detection and elimination of the glosses in the search for the original texts as they came from their authors. . . . A public Version, in my opinion, should be less pedantic and literal than the Revised Version, *and not so slavish in its adherence to the Massoretic text.*¹ In this respect the older Versions, especially the Version of the Book of Common Prayer, is [*sic* H. M. W.] to be preferred; for while it is less accurate than the later Versions, it preserves many readings of the Greek and Vulgate Versions which later English Versions unwisely rejected.”

I proceed to quote some of the relevant dicta of this work:—

*“The earliest Version of the Psalter was that of the Greek Septuagint, translated from the Hebrew in the second century B.C. at Alexandria, and preserved in many ancient codices, the earliest of the fourth century A.D., giving evidence as to an original Hebrew text, many centuries prior to any Hebrew authorities”*² (p. xxv).

“It was made from the best MSS. accessible at the time, and gives evidence as to the original Hebrew text of early second century B.C., three centuries earlier than the text fixed by the school of Jamnia, and twelve centuries earlier than the

¹ My italics.

² Dr. Briggs's italics.

*Mass. text as fixed by Ben Asher and preserved in the earliest Hebrew codd."*¹ (*ibid.*).

"The text of the LXX where there is a consensus of readings *has a value which has not been estimated by critics as highly as it ought to be*, so far as the Psalter is concerned. *In a very large number of cases this common text is to be preferred to the Hebrew consonantal text*"¹ (p. xxviii).

"The text of the LXX carries us still farther back, to a Hebrew text of the second century B.C., very soon after the Psalter had received its final editing" (p. xxxiii).

"*The divine names were inserted very often in order to make it evident that God was the subject or object of the verb*"¹ (p. liii).

"*In a very large number of instances the ancient Versions, especially the LXX and Vulgate, are more correct than the unpointed Hebrew text.* MODERN SCHOLARS HAVE GREATLY ERRED IN A TOO EXALTED ESTIMATE OF THE CORRECTNESS OF THE UNPOINTED HEBREW TEXT IN THIS REGARD. THE MEASURES MAKE IT EVIDENT THAT EVEN THE UNPOINTED HEBREW TEXT, BY ITS NUMEROUS ADDITIONS AND CHANGES OF THE ORIGINAL, IS AS TRULY AN INTERPRETATION OF AN OLDER TEXT AS THE LXX AND OTHER ANCIENT VERSIONS"² (*ibid.*).

Further down on the same page we are told that not infrequently both *Elohim* and *Adonay* "appear as a conflation of the original text." I think I have quoted enough to show that Dr. Briggs, at any rate, is in no case to put forward any vindication of either Dr. Skinner or himself, and that in this controversy he has taken a part which is inconsistent with the elements of truthfulness and honor. So far as he is concerned, the statements about "the principles formed long ago" were a tissue of falsehoods. We shall now see that he

¹ My italics.

² My italics and capitals.

does not stand alone in rejecting the preposterous doctrines that he falsely professes to accept in the correspondence. I begin by quoting Professor Toy, the author of the volume on Proverbs in the International Critical Commentary. In his case we are happily dealing with an honorable man. On p. xxxii of the work he writes: "Of these the oldest and, for the criticism of the text, the most valuable is the Septuagint. It represents in general an older text than that of the received Hebrew tradition." As he was not prepared to sacrifice his convictions on the altar of the documentary theory, Dr. Toy, in reviewing my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," wrote as follows: "Several writers have recently dwelt on the fact that the Septuagint and other ancient Versions differ considerably from the received Hebrew text (the Masoretic) in the use of divine names. . . . The Septuagint translators, it is commonly supposed, followed their Hebrew text faithfully, and this text is equally authoritative with the Masoretic (in both cases internal evidence must decide as to the value of readings): it is concluded that the latter is not a trustworthy guide for a division of documents based on divine names, and this is Mr. Wiener's contention. While this point calls for a more thorough examination than has yet been given it, the conclusion just stated is not out of keeping with the tone of modern criticism. As is well known, critics generally hold that our Hebrew text has suffered greatly from scribes and editors in the process of transmission. It is agreed that divine names have been changed in Chronicles, Psalms and elsewhere, why not in the Pentateuch?"¹ Dr. Toy, it will be seen, is not prepared to contradict the lifelong principles of Dr. Briggs and himself on textual Criticism for the sake of the documentary theory.

¹ *Christian Register*, April 28, 1910, p. 455.

And yet he is a man who suffered for his conscientious beliefs when it appeared to him that the higher criticism was true. My authority is Dr. Briggs, and I quote the account he gives in the General Introduction that I have already cited so often. "The first to suffer for the Higher Criticism in the United States was C. H. Toy, who was Professor of Old Testament Interpretation in the Baptist Theological School, at Greenville, S. C., from 1869 to 1879. In the latter year he was forced to resign because of his views as to Biblical Criticism" (p. 286). As he was the first in the United States to suffer for his Higher Critical views, so has he been the first to admit that those views might be unfounded. *Amicus Plato, magis amica veritas.*

Similarly with Dr. H. P. Smith, from whose pen comes the volume on Samuel in the International Critical Commentary. He writes: "In the absence of light from the MSS. we must seek the help of the ancient versions. And among these the Greek easily takes the first place, owing to its age and to the fact that it had a Hebrew original very different from the one known to us. If we had the LXX in its earliest form, it would be equivalent to a Hebrew codex of the first Christian century, or even of earlier date" (Samuel, p. xxxi). In accordance with this, Dr. Smith has publicly stated that the work of Professors Eerdmans and Schlögl and of the present writer necessitate a careful reëxamination of the whole field of textual and historical Criticism.¹ Dr. Smith, too, according to the same repertory of convenient information, was one of the first to suffer for his critical views. Dr. Briggs writes: "The discussion of the Higher Criticism in the United States began

¹ *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xxx. (1910), p. 19, *note*. See also his statement in the text: "Each year we have the necessity forced upon us to learn something new and to unlearn some of the things we had supposed settled."

for the Presbyterian body, in the plea for freedom of criticism in my inaugural address as Professor of Hebrew in the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y., in 1876. . . . I was sustained by Henry P. Smith. . . . Prof. Henry Preserved Smith was tried on similar grounds. . . . He was also suspended from the ministry in the same year by the Presbytery of Cincinnati, which action was sustained next year by General Assembly" (*op. cit.*, pp. 286-289). Such men as Doctors Toy and Smith must command the respect and admiration of supporters and opponents alike.

It is noticeable that these two men — the two International Critical Commentators who suffered for their beliefs, but were not prepared to throw away their honor for the sake of the documentary theory — had used far less emphatic expressions as to the rôle of the LXX in textual criticism than Dr. Briggs, or even, as we shall see, Dr. Driver himself.

One other International Critical Commentator must be quoted, the late Dr. William Rainey Harper, whose name is affixed to certain papers on Pentateuchal Criticism that appeared in the *Hebraica*, and attracted attention some years ago. The preface to his "Amos and Hosea" contains a polemic against Dr. Driver in the course of which he writes: "It is unquestionably the first duty of a commentator to reconstruct the text as best he may" (Amos and Hosea, preface, p. viii). Further on, in the course of his introduction, he says of the LXX: "In the correction of MT, LXX is most helpful. . . . When due allowance is made for the errors of LXX there still remain many passages in which its text is preferable to M.T." (p. clxxiv).

I come now to Dr. Driver. The attitude as to textual criticism assumed by the general editors of the International Critical Commentary in the letter of the 28th of February,

1911, is more like his general attitude than that of Dr. Briggs. But Dr. Driver himself does not altogether adopt the extraordinary contentions of the letter. I have pointed out some of the ways in which he differs from Dr. Skinner (and consequently from the defense of Dr. Skinner) in reviewing his "Additions, etc.," in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for October, 1911, and also in the second answer to Dr. Gordon in this number. Perhaps the strongest instance of the divergence between the Dr. Driver of textual criticism and the Dr. Driver of the joint letter is, however, to be found on pages lii f. of his "Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel," where he quotes and endorses Klostermann's famous dictum "Let him who would himself investigate and advance learning, by the side of the other Ancient Versions accustom himself above all things to the use of Field's *Hexapla*, and Lagarde's edition of the Recension of Lucian." Why does this principle suddenly cease to be valid when Dr. Skinner's conduct comes up for consideration?

It must not be thought that in laying stress on the question of textual criticism I am urging a principle that is rejected or doubted in the case of other ancient works that have depended on a MS. tradition. On this point let the identical Dr. Briggs speak in the words he has adopted in the work representing the carefully matured convictions of so many years which I have already had frequent occasion to quote: "Biblical Textual Criticism derives from general Textual Criticism its principles and methods of work. These differ in their application to the Bible only as there are special circumstances connected with the biblical writings that differ from those of other writings. As Hort says: 'The leading principles of textual criticism are identical for all writings whatever. Differences in application arise only from differences in the amount, va-

riety, and quality of evidence: no method is ever inapplicable except through defectiveness of evidence' " (General Introduction, p. 231).

Now there can be no doubt that the well-known rules of textual criticism entirely condemn the practice of accepting readings on the authority of any text whatever without investigation. In proof of this I need only quote some of the observations made by Professor J. P. Postgate in the article on "Textual Criticism" in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. He writes as follows:—

"Where the critic has ascertained the earliest form of a reading in his text, he will apply to it the tests of intrinsic probability. No part of a text can be considered exempt from this scrutiny, though for a very large part of it it may be dispensed with. *It should, however, be here observed, that whoever takes a reading without investigation, on the authority either of a manuscript or of a great scholar, or of a number of scholars, ceases for the time being to be a textual critic*"¹ (vol. xxvi. p. 713b).

"Illegitimate doubt is the uncertainty of the doubter as to whether he has examined the whole of the evidence. Such doubt is much more frequently felt than acknowledged, and its effect upon critical work is highly injurious. On the one hand, *it is apt to take refuge in an uncritical acceptance of the traditional readings*, and, on the other hand, to produce a crop of hesitant and mutually destructive conjectures which a reader naturally resents as a needless waste of his time"¹ (*ibid.*, p. 714a).

"Authority, as already hinted, has properly no place in textual criticism. For his facts a textual critic may, and often must, be beholden to others: but never for his opinions. It

¹ My Italics.

adds nothing to the evidence for a reading that it has been approved by a Lachmann or a Madvig or rejected by a Stoeber or a Carutti: and an appeal to names on any such question confuses issues and deters inquiry" (*ibid.*, p. 715b).

The net result of all this is to show, beyond any possibility of doubt, that the general editors of the International Critical Commentary have belied every principle of scholarship, and even of honor, in violation of the very doctrines that one of them has accepted and striven to propagate throughout his life. To all appearance they have as little compunction about deceiving their readers as a fraudulent company promoter has about deceiving the public whom he hopes to despoil.¹ I use this clear language purposely, because I feel that a state of affairs has arisen which must be terminated. We have to deal with a number of professors who abuse their positions in the last way one would expect, for it must be remembered that the public supposes them to be men of high standing actuated by the purest motives, adopting and advocating particular views because those views arise necessarily from the relevant evidence. Now I feel that the time has come when their conduct has passed all reasonable limits, and it is a public duty to say so. If men who should be, and profess to be, servants of truth undertake to abuse their positions by deliberately propagating falsehood, a time comes when it is necessary to denounce them publicly as falsifiers who would never dare to enter a witness-box to sustain their allegations on oath and under cross-examination. Dr. Alexander R. Gordon, of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, affords an excellent illustration of this in the correspondence that ap-

¹ In the case of Dr. Driver the best illustration of the above statement is the volume on Exodus in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. See my review, *ante*, pp. 151-158.

pears in this number of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. In reply to questions whether he had believed Dr. Skinner's representations when he read them, he alleged that he could no more say "yes" or "no" to such questions than he could to the interrogation "Have you left off beating your mother?" In the witness-box he would be on oath, and subject to cross-examination. Dr. Gordon would have either to give straightforward answers to straightforward questions or to take the consequences, which would be ruinous to his reputation; and it would appear clearly that he had been duped by Dr. Skinner. A court of justice is not to be deceived by the methods which are apparently thought good enough for theological students.

Similar considerations apply to Dr. Skinner himself. I once wrote to Dr. Driver, in a private letter for the information of the general editors and Dr. Skinner, that, if the latter brought an action for libel against me, it would be the end of the school of Astruc in England, and I now repeat this statement for the information of a larger public. I propose to devote some little space to explaining exactly why this is so, because in some quarters there appears to be misunderstanding as to precisely what Dr. Skinner has done.

The controversy which has done so much to expose the conduct of the higher critics began with a very innocent question published in the *Expository Times* for May, 1909, by the Rev. A. P. Cox, referring to my article in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for January, 1909.¹ Dr. Skinner answered in the same number, but it was perfectly clear that he had not read my article. Thus he wrote: "in Genesis . . . the LXX [differs from the Jewish version] in 49 [cases] — about one-sixth of

¹ Now reprinted, with slight modifications, in the first chapter of my *Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism*.

the whole." "These facts were not discovered by Mr. H. M. Wiener" — that, at any rate, was a great deal truer than he suspected. Had he read my article he would have found that "these facts" were not facts. He then proceeded: "but are the common property of scholars, whether scholars have always given due weight to them or not. It does not on the face of it look as if very much capital could be made out of so limited a divergence." After some further discussion, which did not in itself prove that he had not read my article, Dr. Skinner proceeded to betray his ignorance again by claiming: (1) that Greek copyists were likely to observe the distinction between the two words less carefully than Jewish scribes; and (2) that where MT and LXX differ the cases where God is used for the Tetragrammaton "show an immense preponderance over those where 'Lord' is used for Elohim, the preference for the common word being as marked as it is intelligible." This was a particularly unnecessary betrayal of ignorance, because Mr. Cox had emphasized the fact that I had adduced evidence showing that the versional variants rest on divergent Hebrew texts, and are not due to avoidance of the Tetragrammaton by translators. Hence a careful reading of the question Dr. Skinner was purporting to answer would have put him on his guard in these matters. After some further discussion, in which he compared the critical achievements to the discovery of America, Dr. Skinner thought fit to lay down what my arguments (which he obviously had not read) could ever accomplish. Now I do not know what standards of honor commend themselves to higher critical minds: but, from the point of view of laymen, it is certain that Dr. Skinner transgressed in two respects: First, although he had not troubled to read my work, he passed adverse judgment on me. It is not the custom among

men of honor to condemn what they have not read.¹ For them, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" is still binding. Secondly, he was deceiving his public by making false representations. Any reader of his note who had not independent knowledge must have supposed that he had read my article, and that he was putting forward statements which he had reasonable ground to believe to be true. In these circumstances I did my best to recall him to a sense of right without exposing him too openly. My reply, which was published in the *Expository Times* for July, 1909, was designed to draw his attention to the article he had not read, and to the unsoundness of his statements of fact and his arguments.² Thus he had twice had public warning—once in Mr. Cox's note and once in mine—of the true state of affairs, and this was reinforced by Professor Schlögl's correction of him in the September number of the same magazine. It was in those circumstances that he took it upon himself to repeat his representations in his volume on Genesis. Of course he could not support his published statements in the witness-box without committing direct perjury, and that is why there can be no question of his bringing proceedings for libel. I did all I could to keep him straight after his first offense by the note in the *Expository Times*: but if the principal of a theological college, after repeated warnings, persists in giving currency to statements which he could not support in the witness-box without committing perjury, a time comes when the interests

¹ It seems, however, to be the usual practice among higher critics. I could give instance after instance that has come to my knowledge, and may perhaps do so on another occasion should necessity arise.

² I fear that Dr. Gordon has not realized this. It is, to say the least, doubtful whether he has done me the justice of carefully reading and considering the *Bibliotheca Sacra* article and comparing it with Dr. Skinner's discussion in his Genesis.

of the public necessitate a full and clear exposure. There is a further reason why no action can be brought. At present the critics are able to use their control of the technical press in the interests of their theories: but an action would give wide publicity to inconvenient facts, and would clearly expose the tactics that they have pursued for years.

One other point must be made. Two friends of Dr. Skinner's wrote to me independently to say that they did not think that he intended to deceive. I answered one by giving him some further facts: whereupon he did not pursue the subject. But is the position tenable? No, it is not; for every man must be supposed to intend the natural and necessary consequences of his own acts. If Dr. Skinner did not intend to deceive, it was open to him (both before and after I had warned him) to tell the truth about my work. He did not do so, but went out of his way to put forward statements that were false, and that he must have seen to be false if he examined my work and Professor Schlögl's. Now in the letter of the 4th of January, 1911, the general editors assert, no doubt truly, that Dr. Skinner had told them that he had examined this work. If this statement of Dr. Skinner's be true — and so far as my work is concerned there are expressions in his "Genesis" which lend it some confirmation — I do not see how anybody can suppose that Dr. Skinner did not intend to deceive. According to his own account, he knew the truth but chose to make statements that were untrue. If he did not intend to deceive by acting thus, what did he intend to do?

Unhappily his offense is a continuing offense, for every fresh reader of his book is likely to be deceived unless he has had warning *aliunde*, and neither Dr. Skinner nor his general editors can be ignorant of this. If, therefore, there were no intention to deceive, the book would long since have

been called in. Old Testament Studies have indeed come to a pretty pass when theological professors and principals can behave as these men have been doing; but obviously matters cannot continue thus. The position is in fact impossible and must shortly be recognized to be so. If men occupying such positions wilfully and persistently give currency to false statements which they could not support in the witness-box without committing perjury, they must in the long run prove the most efficient means of destroying the theories they support.

ARTICLE VII.

THE PURPOSE OF THE BOOK OF RUTH.

BY PROFESSOR LOUIS B. WOLFENSON, MADISON, WISCONSIN.

THE purpose of the Book of Ruth depends largely on the time of composition. Many views of its purpose have been proposed. All of these, practically, are intrinsically impossible on other grounds besides that of date. It is the purpose of the present article to show this for a number of the most widely accepted views. Most of the recent views of the purpose have as a basis a late date of composition. In an article by the present author in the July, 1911, number of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, entitled "The Character, Contents, and Date of Ruth," it was shown that the assumption of a late date rests upon: (1) the opening words of the book, and the quiet and peace which pervade it, but which are supposedly incongruous with the age of the Judges and an early date of composition; (2) the genealogy in iv. 18-22, which is in the style of the Priestly Code, and hence late; (3) the passage iv. 7 relating what was customary "formerly" in Israel; (4) the place of Ruth among the Hagiographa, or last division of the Hebrew Bible, in the Jewish arrangement; and (5) the language of the book, which is supposed to be late and Aramaic. It was pointed out that the first four of these grounds can be most satisfactorily explained with an early date, and that the one word which has been considered irrefutably late, "therefore" (i. 13), must be Hebrew in this meaning. All five grounds for a late date are refuted.

Vol. LXIX. No. 274. 10

On the other hand, it was shown: (1) that the language of the book is early; (2) that the graphic peculiarities are early; (3) that the internal evidence proves, conclusively, an early date, since (*a*) there is no mention of the Passover festival at the time of the barley harvest, (*b*) the manner of conducting the harvest is contrary to Deut. xxiv. 19, hence pre-Deuteronomistic and early, (*c*) the lack of mention of *Shebhu'oth*, or Pentecost, at the conclusion of the harvest, is likewise early, (*d*) the acquirement of Ruth as property in iv. 5 is again pre-Deuteronomistic, — is, indeed, confined to the most early times, — and (*e*) the absence of objection to intermarriage between a Hebrew and a Moabitess is conclusively early. All this, together with the vigor and consummate art of the book, compels us to adopt a pre-Deuteronomistic date.

Lastly, it was shown that Ruth was originally a part of the early Judaic popular David-Bethlehem stories, and stood in the JE-history before the account of Samuel. On account of its relation to King David, it was made an independent book, and then underwent a number of changes at the hands of the redactors of D and P (*R^d* and *RP*), there being added in iv. 5, "to keep alive the name of the dead on his estate," and in iv. 10, the foregoing plus "and that the name of the dead be not cut off from among his brethren and from the gate of his people." Finally, the genealogy iv. 18-22, which is exactly similar to those of the Priestly Code in the Pentateuch, is a later addition by P. At every point, therefore, the Book of Ruth is shown to be of early date.

With an early date for the book, the question of its purpose practically answers itself. Traces of Deuteronomistic editing practically prove that Ruth was once a part of the early Hebrew history J(E).¹ The story of Ruth must, thus,

have been one of a number of stories about Bethlehem and the family of David. The purpose of the book is, therefore, not at all different from that of any other history.

There has, however, been a considerable number of scholars who have considered our book to be a fiction founded perhaps on some old legend, but none the less a fiction. As evidence of this the names in the book are cited. Thus the Hebrew words for Naomi, Mahlon, Kilion, Orpah, and even Ruth and Boaz, are supposed to be fictitious names formed by the writer to illustrate the characters of his story. Very many have thought the names Mahlon and Kilion, which are supposed to mean "Sickness" (from the root *chalah*) and "Consumption" (from the root *kalah*), to allude to the early death of the sons thus named. Ruth has been variously explained as for *re'uth*,³ i.e. "female friend," from the Hebrew root *ra'ah*, or (since the foregoing assumes the loss of the consonant 'ayin, and this is not a usual phenomenon) as from the root *rawah*, "fill or sate," hence "she who satisfies." Boaz has been explained as equal to *bo 'oz*, i.e. "in him is strength," in contrast to Mahlon and Kilion. But there is no proof or necessity that these were the meanings of the names.³ In the case of Boaz and Ruth, the etymologies and explanations given above are quite impossible. The real meaning and derivation of ancient names is very difficult to ascertain, and the idea that these names are fictitious is entirely unfounded. Oettli and Orelli, also, have considered the names authentic and the characters historic. Recently Stucken,⁴ followed by Cheyne⁵ and Winckler,⁶ has thought Ruth to be a mythological legend applied to the history of David's ancestors. Winckler⁷ especially has attempted to work out the theory that Ruth is a representation of Tamar (Gen. xxxviii.) = Ishtar, and that the other char-

! actors are mythological impersonations. Even in Naomi under the name of *Mara'* (i. 20) = *Marah*, Winckler has managed to see a mythological personage, a representation of Tamar, by saying that *Marah* or *Marath* was not the original name, but *Tamar*, a similar form of the imperfect, which, according to him, is the usual Old Testament name of Ishtar. By means of various manipulations of letters and names, Winckler has read a complete system of mythology into the book. But that these manipulations and identifications are true requires as much imagination to believe as Winckler exercised in making them. Professor Haupt in his interpretation of Ruth⁸ rejected the attempt to see any mythology in the book.⁹

Indeed, if the book were at bottom nothing but a myth, none of the manifold purposes for which various scholars have believed the book to have been written would be possible, since a mere fiction would have had little or no weight or effect on the practical-minded Hebrews. An excellent summary of many of the views of the purpose of Ruth will be found in Reuss's "History of the Scriptures of the Old Testament."¹⁰ It is desired to take up here the most important and recent of the views advanced and point out the reasons for their untenability, and particularly so with regard to the view which sees in Ruth a protest against the rigor of Ezra and Nehemiah in the matter of marriage.

1. Bertholdt¹¹ and Benary¹² advanced the theory that Ruth was written to inculcate the duty of the levirate marriage by showing the happy results which followed Boaz' marriage with Ruth. Such a purpose is, however, quite impossible, since not only is this marriage not a levirate marriage, or brother-in-law marriage, but it is not even a Niyoga marriage, or one with the next-of-kin to raise up seed

to a dead relative.¹³ There is in Ruth no purpose of raising up seed to the dead husband of Ruth, nor yet of Elimelech.¹⁴ The only institutions to which reference is made in our book are the ancient customs of redemption of an estate by relatives, and the inheritance of women as property, which make it incumbent upon the heir or redeemer of the property to accept as wife, or otherwise provide for, the wife (or wives) of the dead relative. It is the right and obligation of the redeemer upon which the story of Ruth is based,¹⁵ not the levirate.

2. Reuss believed that the book was written after the fall of Samaria, and had for its purpose the furtherance of a reunion of the remnants of the Northern Kingdom left behind in Ephraim, with the Southern Kingdom, by showing that there could be no patriotic objections to a reunion on the part of the Ephraimites, as the Davidic dynasty in the South was really Ephraimitic. The connection with Ephraim came about, according to Reuss, through Elimelech and his sons Mahlon and Kilion, who were Ephrathites (i. 2) = Ephraimites. Now Ruth was Mahlon's wife, and when she became the wife of Boaz, the offspring of this marriage, Obed, was not alone heir, through Boaz, of Judah, but was also, legally, through Mahlon, the successor or heir (*Rechtsnachfolger*) of an Ephraimite; and thus the descendants of Obed, the sons of Jesse, i.e. the dynasty of David, are really Ephraimitic.

The first and chief reason why Reuss's theory is impossible is because *Ephrathites* (i. 2) does not mean Ephraimites: it is merely a coincidence that the Hebrew *Ephrathite* is the *nomen gentilicium* of the noun Ephrathah as well as of the noun Ephraim. In Ruth here, Ephrathite is intended (cf.

Ephrathah, iv. 11). With this, the basis of Reuss's view is withdrawn, as has been pointed out by a number of writers.¹⁶

Secondly, even if it were true that Ephrathite = Ephraimite, it would still be impossible that Ruth should have been written to pave the way for a reunion of the two kingdoms by showing that there could be no objection on the part of the Ephraimites. Such an objection would still exist. Reuss in his explanation represents the objection on the part of the Ephraimites as due to the fact that the Davidic house was a foreign one with no legal claim to, or connection with, Ephraim. Ruth shows, says Reuss, that this dynasty was, through its ancestor Obed, not alone the natural heir of Judah, but the legal successor of Mahlon, an Ephraimite. But this gives the Southern dynasty only a legal title; and a legal claim the house of David always had, since originally the Northern Kingdom was just as much a part of Israel as the Southern. The Northern state by revolting from the United Kingdom did not destroy the legal title of the Davidic house. Consequently, the Book of Ruth could not have removed the objections of the Ephraimites, granting they had any at that time, and even granting Ephrathite = Ephraimite.

Thirdly, still admitting the foregoing, nobody from reading the book would ever suspect what the object of the author was. Orelli has very justly said: "The political author would have concealed its purpose so effectually that scarcely anybody could have discovered it."¹⁷ Reuss's view has accordingly been rejected on all sides.

3. The view of Ludwig Köhler, that "the booklet of Ruth, for purposes of edification and apparently in a manner freely imaginative, depicts how Jahwe deprives a woman, Naomi, of all hope, how she bows herself to His will, and then how God answers all her prayers and repays her God-

fearing resignation even with happiness,"¹⁸ is rather a homiletical interpretation than the statement of a purpose of the book. In common with the old theologico-homiletical views that Ruth was written for moral purposes (to show the piety of Ruth and power of Yahweh, or to furnish an example of the proper behavior of mothers- and daughters-in-law toward each other¹⁹), Köhler's statement of what the book contains is rather a synopsis of a sermon on the lessons to be drawn from our book than a scientific statement as to the possible purpose of it.

4. Wellhausen²⁰ saw in Ruth a fiction tracing the descent of David to a heathen proselyte, in the manner in which in the Talmud there is a marked predilection for tracing the descent of the most notable Jewish families from heathen proselytes, manifesting itself in considering the most famous Scribes and Rabbis to be descendants of Sisera, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, and Haman.²¹ In this "*Tendenz*,"²² however, Wellhausen saw only a theoretic interest in history as opposed to the *Tendenz*-theory as enunciated by Geiger,²³ upon which the view to be discussed below (6.) is founded. Wellhausen's theory has failed to convince any one but himself, it seems. It cannot be shown that the tendency of the Talmud to trace the origin of Jewish families to heathen proselytes existed previous to the Talmudic age (at least the 3d century A.D.). The Talmudic tendency must have had its origin in the undoubted fact that the early Hebrews were a mixed race, and that many heathens became converted and entered "the congregation of the Lord." This the Rabbis knew, and such a book as Ruth kept the knowledge alive. Thus the tendency may have arisen; but the Book of Ruth is rather a foundation for it than an illustration of the practice.

5. A view of the purpose of Ruth that has frequently been propounded is that it was written to give some details of David's origin and family in addition to what is given in First Samuel. Such information the genealogy (iv. 18-22) is supposed to supply. But this passage may be shown to be a later addition, and must be so regarded. The Book of Ruth as originally written gave very little information as to David's origin and family, for it scarcely mentions David (iv. 17b). Even with the genealogy the amount of information given about David and his immediate family is very meager. We cannot, therefore, believe that the book was written as a separate composition for the purpose of shedding light on David's origin.²⁴

6. The theory that has of recent years found the widest acceptance is the one which makes the Book of Ruth a polemic or protest against the rigor of the reform of Ezra and Nehemiah in the matter of intermarriage of Jews with foreign women.²⁵ The view is found stated in Geiger's "Urschrift" (1857), pp. 49 ff.; it involves a date of composition as late as the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. The dating alone makes this theory quite impossible;²⁶ but for other reasons as well it may be shown to be untenable. In view of the wide prevalence of the theory at present, a statement of the most important objections to it, apart from the fundamental impossibility on the ground of its date, seems advisable.

If Ruth had been written by the opponents of Ezra and Nehemiah in favor of liberality in the matter of intermarriage, one would expect the purpose to appear from the book. But no one could tell from the story that its purpose is such as is claimed. Orelli's criticism of Reuss's view of the object of Ruth applies equally well, *mutatis mutandis*, to this theory: "*The . . . author would have concealed its*

purpose so effectually that scarcely anybody could discover it." Ludwig Köhler²⁷ has also pointed out that the view that the book is a polemical pamphlet is impossible because no trace of polemics appears in it. Professor Bewer,²⁸ likewise, saw the objection "that there is absolutely no indication of polemics in the book." To this Cornill²⁹ replies that a polemic or *Tendenz* should not be too coarse-fibered and obtrusive. Professor Bewer, also, replied to this very pertinent objection that the absence of polemics "might very well be an evidence of supreme art. The book would thus be all the more convincing." These answers, however, are not a refutation, nor even an answer to the objection. If a work is polemical, its object cannot be too obtrusive. Anything tending to make the position of the author more secure, and that of his opponent less forceful or impossible, is not only unobjectionable in a polemic, but a prime necessity. If one writes a pamphlet telling a most charming story, it may be "supreme art"; but if the story has absolutely no bearing on a certain vital issue, or a bearing so remote that even the sharpest intellects have difficulty in seeing any connection, of what use is such a story, be it ever so delightful, as a polemic? The same, too, is true of the *Tendenz*. If the *Tendenz* is not in the book, how can any one be expected to be influenced by it?

The advocates of this theory, however, point to certain features which are supposed to indicate the bearing of the Book of Ruth on the question of intermarriage. Bertholet³⁰ and Nowack³¹ draw attention to the repeated reference to Ruth as "the Moabitess," *hammo'abhiyah* (i. 22; ii. 2, 6, 21; iv. 5, 10), and that she herself speaks of herself as "a stranger" *nokhriyah* (ii. 10.), which is supposed to be unusual emphasis of the fact that Ruth was a Moabitess and stranger. Now this stranger, the Moabitess, attains an ex-

alted position in Israel by becoming the mother of Obed, the grandfather of King David. That a stranger should attain so high an honor in Israel is said to have been due to the blessing of Yahweh. From this, it is argued, the inference is to be drawn that Yahweh did not curse every marriage with a foreign woman, and hence such marriages are permissible. In this consists the *Tendenz* of the book, and because of this it is believed that Ruth was written at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the question of intermarriage was being adjusted.

The assumption of a *Tendenz* on the foregoing basis is, I believe, entirely unjustified. It will be observed that the assumption is based upon the occurrence of "the Moabitess" six times and "stranger" once, as applied to Ruth. This is by no means an undue emphasis of the fact of Ruth's foreign origin, and is not even a frequent reference to this circumstance — at least not frequent enough to justify the conclusion that the happy outcome of this one marriage is to be construed as an argument for other marriages of the same sort, and hence as a *Tendenz*. And, furthermore, when the text of the passages concerned is critically examined, it develops that of the six occurrences of *hammo'abhiyah*, "the Moabitess," the word is twice shown to be a gloss (ii. 2, 21) by the ancient versions — a fact that has thus far escaped notice or not been sufficiently considered.³² This leaves but four cases in which the word is genuinely used, so that there is no undue emphasis laid upon the fact that Ruth is a Moabitess, as in each of these instances the adjective is necessary to the thought. *Nokhriyah*, "stranger" (ii. 10), too, lays no undue stress on Ruth's being a foreigner, since, in the context in which the word is used, the sense is rather that of 'stranger, unknown person' (a sense which preserves the more original

meaning of the word³³), as the next verse, "It hath fully been showed me," etc., proves.

In state of affairs there seems to be no justification for the *Tendenz*-theory. Only those who are looking for some ground for an unlikely theory could elaborate an ulterior motive from the few and necessary descriptions of Ruth. Orelli is right in saying: "The naïve simplicity and grace of the narrative refute the hypothesis of a mere *Tendenz* and didactic composition."³⁴

However, even if we should grant that there may be some *Tendenz* in the Book of Ruth, as there is not, it would still be impossible to suppose the account to have been written as a protest against the rigor of Ezra and Nehemiah — a polemic advocating liberality in the matter of intermarriage. How could one reasonably argue that because a particular intermarriage resulted in a blessing to all concerned, such marriages were in general permissible? The exception only proves the rule; and nobody could thus legitimately argue from one case, and that, too, one that occurred under widely different conditions and circumstances. What was common practice and permissible at the time of the Judges was later forbidden; and to argue that because at that time Yahweh blessed one such marriage, even though it were the ancestors of King David, foreign marriages at any time, and particularly at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, were permissible, would have been most illogical and unconvincing. Moreover, the number of such marriages with non-Hebrew women was large³⁵ in the early time, and to cite the case of the happy marriage of Ruth and Boaz, who lived long before even David (through whom it was that Ruth and Boaz receive their importance), when David and Solomon and many others had foreign wives in still later times and were cen-

sured therefor,³⁶ would have had as much effect on the mind of the people of the times of Ezra and Nehemiah as it would have now, i.e. none at all. This theory of the purpose of the book is illogical and hence untenable.

The proof of the utter lack of cogency in the argument lies in the fact that the people themselves who, at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, had taken foreign women to wife, never denied that they had done wrong: they at once admitted this, and agreed to put away their foreign wives.³⁷ Those who clung to their wives did so in spite of their knowledge that their marriage with foreign women was not permissible or justifiable, and without, indeed, trying to justify their course of action. There was really no person who did not feel the logic of Ezra's argument.³⁸

The reasons for this will be clear from a consideration of the circumstances in Judea at that time. They were of a peculiar nature. The community at Jerusalem had just returned from the Captivity and become again established, and they were few in numbers.³⁹ If, now, many of the people intermarried with foreign women, it meant the extinction of the nation and race⁴⁰—the second and third generation would no longer be Hebrews (Jews), but Ashdodites, Ammonites, and Moabites.⁴¹ The feeling at this time was intense, and immediate action was imperative if the nation, race, and religion were to be preserved. Forceful measures were adopted to compel the priests and people to abandon their foreign consorts.⁴² This action had its effect. The loyal Hebrews (Jews) clung to their race and their God, and so the people survived to this day.

Are we now to suppose that the very few bolder and powerful men, who, at this juncture, were traitors to the cause of Yahweh and chose to cling to their wives of foreign race

rather than to their people and God, adopted the feeble method of writing or causing to be written a story of ancient days⁴⁸—the Book of Ruth? Could any composition, no matter how forceful, have had any effect against the vigorous policy of Ezra and Nehemiah? And are we to suppose that the Book of Ruth, which at most contains seven references to the fact that Ruth was a foreign woman and says not a word in favor of such marriages—are we to suppose that this book was written as a protest against Ezra and Nehemiah?

The theory, therefore, that Ruth was written as a campaign pamphlet or "*Tendenzschrift*" seems to reduce itself to an absurdity (*reductio ad absurdum*), and would, thus, as in geometry, be shown to be impossible. As was pointed out, the theory involves a late date, which renders it *hors de combat*. Lastly, if written according to the theory, it seems most certain that the book would never have been included in the Hebrew scriptures. The memory of its purpose could not have died out, since the Scribes and Rabbis were the direct heirs of the traditions of Ezra and Nehemiah; and since they, later, determined which books should be considered sacred, they would surely have rejected Ruth.

There is, accordingly, no acceptable theory of the purpose of our book which has thus far been proposed. It has, in fact, no set purpose any more than any other historical narrative. Moreover, if Ruth was originally a part of the great history of J(E), as I have shown, I believe, to be likely,⁴⁴ we need look for no purpose in our book beyond that which any episode in a history has.

NOTES.

¹ Cf. author's article, *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, July, 1911, pp. 298, 299.

² Cf. the Syriac form of the name, *r'uth*.

³ *Mahlon* may have meant "Sickness" or "Weakness"; but that it referred to the early death of the son so named is not a necessary conclusion. *Kilion*, on the other hand, probably never meant "Consumption." The root *kalah* means 'to end, be complete,' and hence "Completion" is as probable, at least, as "Consumption," for the meaning. It may have referred to the fulfillment of a vow or the like, and have been a usual Hebrew name. Professor Haupt has pointed out to the author that *Kilion* may mean "Perfection" (like *Mikhlol*), comparing *Tikhlah*, etc. With regard to *Mahlon*, "Sickness," Dr. Haupt questions whether a mother would be apt to name her child thus, as it would be a bad omen. He has also pointed out that *Mahlon* may be connected with *chaliy* and *chelyah*. Syriac *chly* means 'sweet,' Arabic *hhaliya*, *hhulu*, *mahlili*, 'candy,' etc. This would make *Mahlon* mean "Sweet," "Sweetness," etc.; cf. the present "honey" applied to children as a term of endearment.

⁴ *Astralmythen*, p. 110.

⁵ Art. "Ruth," *Encycl. Bibl.*

⁶ *Altoriental. Forschungen*, vol. III. part I., *Rut*, pp. 65 ff.; cf. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament* (3d ed. Berlin; 1903), p. 229, n. 2.

⁷ *Altoriental. Forsch.*, I. c.

⁸ In the Old Test. Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, 1904-05.

⁹ H. Zimmern (Schrader, *op. cit.*, p. 438) very moderately states that the figures of the biblical patriarchal history, etc., may be direct reflexes (*directe Nachwirkung*) of Babylonian gods, and that Ruth, among other personages, may go back to the Babylonian Ishtar in some features (*einzelne Züge*) with more or less probability (*mit mehr oder weniger Wahrscheinlichkeit*). In spite of Stucken and Winckler's far-reaching assumptions and assertions (*sehr weitgehende Aufstellungen*, n. 1), Zimmern does not seem to consider the whole subject as more than a possibility; his reserve in entering upon a presentation of the various features (*ohne in Einzelerörterungen desselben einzutreten*) may fairly be taken as an indication of his position on this subject, and that he saw "less probability" (*weniger Wahrscheinlichkeit*) in the case of Ruth.

¹⁰ Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments (2d ed.), sect. 243.

¹¹ Einleitung, pp. 2331 ff.

¹² De Hebræorum Leviratu (Berolini, 1835).

¹³ As believes Driver, Literature of the Old Testament (10th ed.), p. 455 and note 2. Reuss, Geschichte d. hell. Schrift. (2d ed.), p. 314, below, rightly saw that there is no levirate nor Niyoga in the book.

¹⁴ Ruth iv. 5, 10, and i. 13 are the passages upon which the view of a levirate marriage is founded. But in iv. 5, 10, the reference to raising up seed is a later addition, and in i. 13 there is no such idea.

¹⁵ Cf. chaps. iii. and iv. The acquirement of Ruth as property in chap. iv. represents an ancient custom essentially identical with the old Arabic custom, against which practice Qoran iv. 23. 26 is aimed.

¹⁶ Cf., e.g., Bertholet, Commentary on Ruth, Intro., p. 51, 1); Nowack, Commentary, p. 183, 2.

¹⁷ Art. "Ruth," Realencyclopädie (2d ed.), vol. xlii. p. 142; cf. 3d ed. (1906), p. 267: "Der politische Author hätte seine Absicht so gut versteckt, dass sie kaum jemand herausfinden mochte."

¹⁸ In Theol. Tijdschrift, 1904, p. 472. His words are: "Das Büchlein Ruth stellt in erbaulicher Absicht und in wahrscheinlich vielfach freierfundener Weise dar, wie Jahwe einer Frau Naemi alle Hoffnung nimmt, wie diese sich . . . unter seine Hand beugt, und wie dann Gott . . . alle ihre Wünsche erfüllt und sie für ihre gottesfürchtige Ergebung sogar mit Glücke belohnt."

¹⁹ The latter view is that of Noldenhawer, cited by Reuss, Geschichte d. hell. Schrift. (2d ed.), p. 313; cf. *idem* for other similar views.

²⁰ In Bleek-Wellhausen, Einleitung (4th ed.), p. 205.

²¹ For examples of this, see Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, *Pereq Cheleq*.

²² I.e. "hidden purpose, or tendency; ulterior motive, or tendency to a certain purpose."

²³ U'schrift, 1857, pp. 49 ff.

²⁴ P. de Lagarde, *Orientalia* (Göttingen, 1880), vol. ii. p. 41, says that the statement in iv. 18, viz. "Now these are the generations of Perez," shows that the author of Ruth intended to indicate that the house of David was equivalent to that of Aaron. This reveals a purpose to aggrandize the house of David. Cf. also the theory advanced by Lagarde in *Mittheilung* (Göttingen, 1891), vol. iv. p. 313. below.

²⁵ Cf. Ezra ix. ff.; Neh. xlii. 23 f.

* Cf. author's art., *l.c.*, pp. 291-300.

* In Teyler's Theol. Tijds., 1904, part II. pp. 458 ff.

* In Am. Jour. Sem. Languages, April, 1904, p. 205, below.

* Einleitung (5th ed.), p. 159, sect. 22, note.

* Com. on Ruth. p. 52.

* Com. on Ruth, p. 184.

* In these two cases the word *hammo'abhiyah*, "the Moabitess," is quite out of place in the Hebrew, as it is not necessary to the thought; and, knowing the weakness of scribes for adding epithets and details on the basis of cases where there is a necessity for them, there can be no doubt that *hammo'abhiyah* is a gloss. A similar gloss, not noted recently, is *hashshabha*, "which returned" (I. 22); likewise *bisadheh mo'abh*, "in the country of Moab" (I. 6). Is such a gloss, I believe.

* Cf. Heb. *zar*, 'strange'; then 'foreign.'

* Art. "Ruth," Realencyc. (3d ed.), p. 267: "Gegen die Annahme einer blossen Tendenz- und Lehrdichtung sträubt sich die naive Einfalt und Anmut der Erzählung."

* Cf. Judges III. 6, 14 ff. (Samson); 1 Sam. xxvii. 3; 2 Sam. v. 13 (David); 1 Kings xi. 1 ff. (Solomon), etc.

* *Ibid.*

* Ezra x. 5, 12.

* Neh. xiii. 28 is not at all against this, as the son of Joiada undoubtedly clung to his alliance for personal and political ambition.

* Ezra ix. 8.

* Ezra ix. 14 f.

* Neh. xiii. 23, 24.

* Ezra x. 9-44; Neh. xiii. 24 f., 28, 30.

* The theory of Winckler and Cheyne that Ruth is a mere myth, and yet was written as a protest against the rigorous policy of Ezra and Nehemiah, seems singularly impossible when viewed in the light of the real events of this period.

* Cf. author's art., *l.c.*, pp. 298 ff.

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTE.

THE NEGEB IN EXODUS.

THE use of the word נֶגֶב, *Negeb*, for "south" in chapters xxvi.-xl. of Exodus has long been a crux, since the word properly means the dry land in the south of Judah, and this was not to the south of the Israelites in the wilderness. As Robertson Smith emphatically put it: "Moses could no more call the south side the Nêgeb side of the tabernacle than a Glasgow man could say that the sun set over Edinburgh."¹ J. Weiss in his recent edition of Exodus² says, with reason, that in xxvi. 18 the word is a gloss, but he does not go into the evidence for the matter. I find that the LXX presents some striking phenomena in some of the relevant passages, and it seems to me desirable to draw attention to these. The final solution of the problem cannot be reached until more study has been devoted to the textual history of the concluding chapters of Exodus, but I think that this is likely to be helped by calling notice to the singularities that have special reference to our difficulty.

There are five passages in which the Massoretic text presents us with the word; viz. xxvi. 18 with the recapitulatory passage xxxvi. 23, xxvii. 9 with its recapitulatory passage xxxviii. 9, and finally xl. 24 (LXX 22). The last of these passages does not call for special mention, as the LXX does not differ from the Massoretic text, and attention will therefore be concentrated on the other four.

It must first be noticed that in all four cases the Massoretic text presents us not with one word to denote direction, but with two, "the south side, southward," etc. In all these

¹The Old Testament in the Jewish Church (2d ed.), p. 326. For the contrary view, see the Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. iv. (1898) p. 524.

²Das Buch Exodus übersetzt und erklärt. Graz und Wien. 1911. Vol. LXIX. No. 274. 11

cases the first word only is *Negeb*, the second being the unexceptionable תימנה. The tautology is, of course, strongly in favor of the gloss theory. And it is supported by the fact that in three instances the LXX clearly had only *one* word, while the fourth passage (xxxvi. 23) is missing altogether from the pre-Hexaplar Greek. But this is not all.

In Exodus xxvi. 18, 20, 22, the Massoretic text has the order south, north, west. Not so the LXX. It has north, south, west (though there is some weak authority obviously influenced by the present Hebrew for the Massoretic order). Further, it uses, for "south," τὸ πρὸς νότον, i.e. its rendering for תימנה in verse 35 of the same chapter, where even the Hebrew does not read *Negeb*. Hence it seems that the view of Weiss is here strongly supported by the Greek evidence.

In the other two passages the facts are more complicated. While this makes them harder to interpret it certainly adds to the interest. In chapter xxvii. a convenient conspectus of the important facts may be given as follows:—

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	SEPTUAGINT.
Ex. xxvii. 9.	On the side of the Negeb, southwards.	(1) On the southward side (τὸ πρὸς λαβα being used), B and four cursives. (2) On the northward side, M (margin) and about five cursives. (3) On the southward side (τὸ πρὸς νότον), F, M (text), and the great majority of Septuagintal authorities.
Ex. xxvii. 11.	On the northward side.	(1) On the eastward side (ἀπὸ ἀριστερῆς being used), B, M (margin), and three cursives. (2) On the northward side, A, F, M (text), and almost all the other authorities.

REFERENCE.	MASSORETIC TEXT.	SEPTUAGINT.
Ex. xxvii. 12.	On the westward side.	On the westward side.
Ex. xxvii. 13.	On the eastward side, orient-wards.	(1) On the southward side [νότον] B and a number of cursives. (2) On the eastward side [ἀνατολῆς], A, F, M(text), and almost all authorities.

To appreciate these facts fully it will be necessary to have regard to the evidence in the recapitulatory passage; but certain phenomena may be noted at once. Only in the case of verse 12 is there complete agreement. In the other verses the LXX is divided against itself. F and the text of M, together with the great majority of the authorities, clearly represent a Hebrew that differed from the Massoretic text only in having one expression, instead of two, for south in verse 9, and for east in verse 13. While, therefore, they testify to the fact that the Massoretic text is glossed, they do not otherwise assist us to recover the original order of the LXX. If we turn from them to B, the best MS., we find that of the four quarters, *two* (verses 9 and 13) are south, and the north is entirely missing. Further, two words are used for south, *λίβα*, in verse 9, and *νότον* in verse 13. Obviously there must originally have been a "north," and one or other of these two words has replaced the earlier text. Which of the two is it? The answer is clear for three reasons: (1) in verse 9, B's "south" may be an accommodation to the later Hebrew, but it cannot be so in verse 13. Hence it is more likely to be corrupt in the earlier verse; (2) "north" has been preserved by some good authorities as the original reading in verse 9; and (3) the presumption is in favor of the original translators having used the same word *νότος* as in the other passages of these chapters rather than *λίψ*. Hence we may infer that the original LXX had north, east, west, south. It should further be noticed that the rarer *ἀπηλιώτης* for "east" in verse 11 is far more likely to be the original text of the LXX than the common *ἀνατολῆς*.

Much of this receives striking confirmation from the phenomena presented by xxxviii. 9-13 (in the LXX xxxvii. 7-11). The material words in the Massoretic text are the same as in the earlier passage, but the best LXX text has five quarters. In xxxvii. 7 = M. T. xxxviii. 9 it reads "southwards," *λιβα* being used, but M(text) and many cursives have *νότον*. In verse 9 it has two clauses — the earlier "northwards," the second "southwards," *νότον* being used. The second clause is, however, omitted by M and many other MSS. In verse 11 it has *ἀνατολάς* with very weak evidence for *νότον*. It should be added that an old Latin copy reads "north" in verse 7, "east" in verse 10, and "west" in verse 11.

I think that the five quarters in this passage afford corroborative evidence that the original Septuagintal text of chapter xxvii. knew nothing of the Negeb. The order was different, and, alike for east and south, it found only one word in its Hebrew. In the latter respect it indubitably had a purer Hebrew text than our Massoretic text. Whether its order of the four quarters is the more original is a subject on which I am not prepared to offer an opinion. And with respect to its text in xxxvii. it seems to me that judgment must be suspended until the whole problem of the text of the concluding chapters of Exodus has been thoroughly investigated.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

ARTICLE IX.

A. CORRESPONDENCE WITH DR. GORDON.

FROM DR. GORDON.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE,
MONTREAL, Aug. 25, 1911.

To the EDITOR of the "Bibliotheca Sacra."

Dear Sir:—

I have just read the correspondence in your July number, arising out of my review of Dr. Skinner's "Genesis." I have no desire to enter into the controversy further than to disclaim Mr. Wiener's suggestion that I have been either "deceived" or "misled" by Dr. Skinner in regard to the questions under dispute. I have long been familiar with the critical problem, and written not a little on the subject. To the recent assaults on the "prevalent hypothesis" I have given very considerable attention. When I wrote my review of Dr. Skinner's book I was perfectly familiar with the articles of Schlögl and others in the *Expository Times*. Since reading the correspondence, I have refreshed my knowledge of Schlögl's argument, and still fail to see how so violent a cutting of the knot can be held to solve a problem which involves very much more than mere alternation of the Divine names in Genesis. On Schlögl's critical principles, indeed, one might prove or disprove any given hypothesis at will. The modern commentator on "Genesis" has such a mass of really important matter to deal with, that he may surely be permitted to pass over in silence "evidence" that seems to him to have no vital bearing on the case, without being compelled to face charges of "suppression of facts, suggestion of falsehood, ignoring of arguments."

I shall be glad if you insert this disclaimer in some forthcoming number of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

Yours faithfully,

ALEX. R. GORDON.

FROM MR. WIENER.

By the courtesy of the editor I have been able to see Dr. Gordon's letter before its publication. I need only point out that it leaves my charges absolutely untouched. I never accused Dr. Skinner of deceit for not mentioning Schlögl's *argument*: I charged him with deceit for having represented to his readers (1) that there were not more than 50 variants in Genesis, and (2) that the Septuagintal variants could all be due to intra-Greek causes when to his knowledge both these representations were false. If Dr. Gordon is prepared to say that he disbelieved Dr. Skinner's representations on these points when he read them, then he was neither misled nor deceived: but if (as I think his *Expositor* article proves) he in fact believed them, then I fear he *was* deceived. But this much I should like to add. In my opinion Dr. Gordon was entitled to suppose that Dr. Skinner was telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth: and I need scarcely say that far from thinking that Dr. Gordon's acting on this supposition in any way casts a slur on him it was the natural thing for him to do without troubling at the time to refresh his memory as to my articles. It was because Dr. Gordon was so manifestly an honest and competent writer on the subject that I felt compelled to take action in the matter. Dr. Gordon's honesty and competence are the measure of Dr. Skinner's intellectual dishonesty.

I take this opportunity of reminding Dr. Gordon that in spite of "the very considerable attention" he has given to "recent assaults on the prevalent hypothesis," neither he nor anybody else has yet ventured to deal with the other points made in my *Expositor* reply to him—the original date of Gen. x. 19, the practice of non-sacrificial slaughter in Israel long before the various critical dates for Deuteronomy, and the inability of Wellhausen and his followers to distinguish between a mound and a house as the basis of the prevalent reconstruction of the history.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

8 September, 1911.

FROM DR. GORDON.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE,
MONTREAL, Sept. 21, 1911.

The EDITOR, Bibliotheca Sacra.

Dear Sir:—

I am obliged to you for your kindness in sending me a copy of Mr. Wiener's letter before publication. I cannot however allow my "honesty" to be made the measure of Dr. Skinner's "dishonesty." In the matter in question, we both occupy the common ground of scholarship. As I said before, the modern commentator has such a mass of really important matter to deal with, that he must necessarily exercise a wise discretion. This applies to his citation of variants from the Versions as well as to references to literary authorities. Some of these are valuable: but many more are mere phenomena of greater or less interest. The latter group the textual critic will pass over without any necessary mention. Dr. Skinner has cited the Septuagintal variants in Genesis as registered by so careful students of the Septuagint as Redpath and Eerdmans. Mr. Wiener adduces a further "enormous number of passages," where "*some* Septuagintal authority differs from the ordinary LXX. reading." Dr. Skinner does not recognise these latter variants as sufficiently authenticated or important to enter into the question. In arriving at that opinion, and acting on it, he is just as entitled to be called "honest" as one who urges the importance of the whole list. The question is really one of opinion, or critical judgment, not of "honesty." And one cannot but regret that Mr. Wiener continues to press his charges against so simple, sincere, and absolutely candid a man as Dr. Skinner.

Yours faithfully,

ALEX. R. GORDON.

FROM MR. WIENER.

I have carefully read Dr. Gordon's letter, but fail to see that he has a single word to say with regard to the other points I made against him in the *Expositor*. Is he unable to

produce any reply at all? Or does he think it immaterial whether the results of the Wellhausen school are correct to within a thousand years or so, and whether or not their main theory rests on nothing more substantial than their inability to distinguish between a mound and a house?

Turning to the question of Dr. Skinner everybody must sympathise with the motives that prompt Dr. Gordon, but such sympathy must not allow us to condone a deliberate attempt to deceive the public. In my former reply I pointed out that I had "charged Dr. Skinner with deceit for having represented to his readers (1) that there were not more than 50 variants in Genesis, and (2) that the Septuagintal variants could all be due to intra-Greek causes when to his knowledge both these representations were false." On the second point Dr. Gordon says nothing at all. I therefore challenge him to answer the following direct question with a plain "aye" or "no": (a) Did he believe Dr. Skinner's representations on the point when he read them? If he did believe them, then he was deceived, for to deceive only means to procure an innocent person to believe a representation which is false to the knowledge of the person who procures the belief.

On the first point however Dr. Gordon attempts to argue the question. According to him "Dr. Skinner does not recognise variants other than those registered by Redpath or Eerdmans as sufficiently authenticated or important to enter into the question." That this is untrue is shown by the fact that Dr. Skinner himself has in another context actually adopted a Syriac reading that is not registered by Redpath or Eerdmans. Next, as even Dr. Skinner's own general editor observes, "neither Redpath's nor Eerdmans' list is *exact*" [Driver, Genesis, 8th ed., p. XLIV, note]. Again if Dr. Gordon will read the contributions of Redpath and Eerdmans, he will see that neither of them has used Lucian or the evidence of Field's Hexapla as to the original readings of the Septuagint as found by Origen. Will he venture to say that any competent scholar could honestly reject either the one or the other as "not sufficiently authenticated or important"? Nor

again is it true to say that "the question is really one of opinion or critical judgment," for Dr. Skinner put it forward as a question of *fact*. His argument was that while the facts adduced by a number of writers of whom I was one, imported an element of uncertainty into the analysis, the significance of the facts was greatly overrated. He then alleged that so far as he had observed no attention was paid to the proportion of divergences to agreements as between LXX and M.T., that the Divine names occurred about 340 times in Genesis, that the total deviations registered by Redpath numbered 50 while according to Eerdmans they were 49 i.e. little more than one-seventh of the whole. He then proceeded: "Is it so certain that that degree of divergence invalidates a documentary analysis founded on so much larger a field of undisputed readings?" I therefore challenge Dr. Gordon to answer the following direct questions also with a plain 'aye' or 'no': (b) Did he when he read these representations believe (i) that the facts adduced by the writers of whom I was one were limited to at most 50 passages in Genesis; (ii) that I had overlooked the proportion of divergences to agreements or that Dr. Skinner had reasonable cause to suppose that I had overlooked it; and (iii) that save in little more than one-seventh of the whole number of occurrences the readings were "undisputed"? If Dr. Gordon can answer questions (a) and (b) in the negative, he is entitled to say that he cannot allow his honesty to be made the measure of Dr. Skinner's dishonesty; but not otherwise.

Two other points made by Dr. Gordon must be shortly noticed. He says with truth that the modern commentator has such a mass of really important matter to deal with that he must exercise a wise discretion. That however does not justify him in making false representations on a matter with which in the exercise of that wise discretion he decides to deal. It is as if in reply to a charge that A had lied on a particular question, somebody were to say 'Ah, but look at the mass of things from among which he had to select topics for conversation'! Secondly Dr. Gordon calls Dr. Skinner

"simple, sincere and absolutely candid" and regrets that I should continue to press my charges. Well, I will tell him something of my experience. I find that the Wellhausen theories are supported by a large number of professors in various parts of the world, who have enormous power by virtue of their positions, the numbers of their supporters and the extent to which they and their supporters control the general and technical press. That power is used with the utmost unscrupulousness to prevent any opponent of theirs from getting a fair hearing and to induce their pupils and the general public to believe that their theories are unchallengeably true. There are many ways of being dishonest, and as a general rule the Wellhausen critics use more caution than Dr. Skinner has done: but with a few striking exceptions they fall as far short of the standards of conduct observed by honorable laymen as does Dr. Skinner himself. As a result I have been driven to adopt the course that I have followed in this instance to expose the methods by which the Wellhausen theory is maintained. If Dr. Gordon or any other critic finds this plain statement of fact unpalatable, the remedy for this state of affairs lies in his own hands. Let him take the works of the conservative writers and tackle them honestly, grappling with each point in turn, refuting it or admitting its validity publicly. Then and only then will he have a right to pronounce opinion as to who is or is not "simple, sincere, and absolutely candid."

HAROLD M. WIENER.

LINCOLN'S INN, 6 October, 1911.

FROM DR. GORDON.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE,
MONTREAL, Nov. 18, 1911.

The EDITOR, *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

Dear Sir:—

I am in receipt of yours of the 15th., enclosing Mr. Wiener's rejoinder to my last letter.

As I entered this controversy purely to make a personal

statement, I must respectfully decline to be drawn into a discussion of the general critical problem of the Pentateuch. Further, I have to observe that the questions Mr. Wiener propounds for me are all based on the gratuitous assumption that Dr. Skinner is dishonest because he happens to differ from Mr. Wiener on what is to be considered valid evidence. They virtually resolve themselves into this. Did I believe Dr. Skinner to be telling the truth when he was really lying? — a question that can no more be answered by a simple “Yes” or “No” than the old subtlety of the logic books, “Have you left off beating your mother?” I must content myself then with the general statement — and with this the correspondence must close, so far as I am concerned — that in my judgment Dr. Skinner has, within the limits imposed by his Commentary, given a perfectly fair presentation of the problems of Genesis, including the relation between the Massoretic text and the Versions. Repeated study of his work confirms me in the impression that he has given all due consideration to the “facts” brought forward by Mr. Wiener, and has appraised them at their true value.

Yours faithfully,

ALEX. R. GORDON.

FROM MR. WIENER.

Every reader will be able to see for himself that Dr. Gordon refuses to answer plain straightforward questions, and this provides a fresh example — this time in public — of the methods by which it is sought to maintain the current critical theories. For myself I confess that I am disappointed, but not in the least surprised. Dr. Gordon's methods can of course make no difference to the triumph of truth: but it appears to me that they reveal a lamentable state of affairs.

For what are the questions about Dr. Skinner that Dr. Gordon refuses to answer in response to my challenge? They are these:—(a) Did Dr. Gordon believe Dr. Skinner's representations that the Septuagintal variants could all be due to intra-Greek causes when he (Dr. Gordon) read them?

(b) Did Dr. Gordon when he read Dr. Skinner's representations as to the number of variants in Genesis believe (i) that the facts adduced by the writers of whom I was one were limited to at most 50 passages in Genesis, (ii) that I had overlooked the proportion of divergences to agreements or that Dr. Skinner had reasonable cause to suppose that I had overlooked it, and (iii) that save in little more than one-seventh of the whole number of occurrences the readings were "undisputed"?

I asked Dr. Gordon whether he believed Dr. Skinner, nothing more: I did not ask him whether he believed Dr. Skinner to be telling the truth when he was really lying: for Dr. Skinner's mendacity had been put beyond all doubt by the earlier correspondence with the general editors: and the point at issue with Dr. Gordon was simply whether the latter had believed the statements which had been proved false and so been deceived. Dr. Gordon's only reply is to say in effect "I can no more answer 'yes' or 'no' to questions whether I believed Dr. Skinner's statements when I read them than I can answer 'yes' or 'no' to the question 'Have you left off beating your mother?'" *Qui est-ce qu'on trompe ici?*

Dr. Gordon has of course rendered a very real service to the cause of truth by making it quite plain that he dare not commit himself to a statement that he believed Dr. Skinner. Whether he has also rendered Dr. Skinner or his general editors any real service thereby is a question that I do not feel called upon to discuss: and I leave my readers to form their own judgments on the fitness of professors who act as these critics have done to be entrusted with the education of youth. Some things are too plain to need emphasizing.

I should be sorry to lose this opportunity of once more reminding Dr. Gordon that he has as yet totally failed to produce any reply to the points I put to him over a year ago during the intervals of leisure in which he was not engaged in making personal statements. As I pointed out in my first communication those points are the original date of Gen. x. 19, the practice of non-sacrificial slaughter in Israel long before

the various critical dates for Deuteronomy, and the inability of Wellhausen and his followers to distinguish between a mound and a house as the basis of the prevalent reconstruction of history. What shall be said of men who propagate views the correctness of which to within a thousand years they are unable to defend?

HAROLD M. WIENER.

LINCOLN'S INN, 29 November, 1911.

ARTICLE X.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT CELTS. By J. A. MACCULLOCH, Hon. D.D. (St. Andrews); Hon. Canon of Cumbrae Cathedral. 8vo. Pp. xv, 399. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Within recent years Celtic studies have engaged the serious attention of many able investigators, Continental as well as British, whose indefatigable labors have brought into full and closer view a world long half-buried and otherwise dimly seen. The gain to the general cause of learning will be incalculable. Indeed, already every department of anthropological science has been enriched with contributions of enduring worth through the careful investigation and study of Celtic remains and survivals.

Dr. MacCulloch's book sets forth in detail and in orderly arrangement all the leading facts that have been ascertained regarding "The Religion of the Ancient Celts," and cannot fail to interest the general reader as well as the special student. The author, a Celt by birth and experience, has written much on kindred subjects and shows himself otherwise to have been well qualified for the task he has here performed. The work has, it would seem, gained much of worth and lost nothing of scientific finish from having been "written during a long residence in the Isle of Skye, where the old language of the people still survives, and where the *genius loci* speaks everywhere of things remote and strange" (Preface, p. ix).

The book is made up of twenty-four chapters, all of which are interesting and instructive but especially so are those treating of "The Cult of the Dead" (x.), "River and Well Worship" (xii.), "Tree and Plant Worship" (xiii.), "Animal Worship" (xiv.), "Sacrifice, Prayer, and Divination"

(xvi.), "Festivals" (xviii.), "The Druids" (xx.), "Magic" (xxi.), and "The State of the Dead" (xxii.). The amount of labor involved in the preparation of this volume may be estimated in part from the fact that Chapter XVI. (which may be taken as fairly illustrative of the rest), dealing with "Sacrifice, Prayer, and Divination," contains about 180 references to some eighty authors, ancient, mediæval, and modern. Such copiousness of accurate and apposite reference makes the work invaluable for the student. It should be observed that now and then a reference is slightly inaccurate. Thus, "Strabo, xii. 5. 2" (p. 161) should be "Strabo, xii. 5. 1"; "Strabo, iv. 4. 4" (p. 235, last footnote) should be "Strabo, iv. 4. 5"; "Cæsar, [B.G.] v. 27" (p. 216) should be "Cæsar, B.G. v. 28."

Typographical errors are extremely few and concern mostly the use of accents and the hyphen. The mark of interrogation has been dropped out at the end of line 7, page 16. On page 45 occurs "*Matres Campestræ*" (for "*Matres Campestres*"?). "Magtured" occurs on page 53, line 3; but on page 54, line 6 (and elsewhere), "Mag-tured." In a footnote on page 72 the word "*Finntraga*" bears an acute accent on its penult, but, in a footnote on the following page, appears without the accent. On page 74, line 2, the word "*dan*" bears an acute accent, but in line 3, a circumflex accent. On page 301, line 27, occurs this: "Later writers gives. . . ." But, on the whole, the work has been printed with unusual accuracy.

The author's style is, in general, well suited to the exposition of his subject; but some of his sentences betray a momentary lack of accurate thinking. Thus, on page 284 occurs this inquiry: "Did Cæsar conclude, or was it actually the case, that . . .?" I take it the author meant to make some such query as this: Did Cæsar merely conjecture, or did he actually know, that . . .? The author's diction, also, is peculiar at times. On page 182 he says: "On inscriptions a river name is prefixed by some divine epithet." Does this mean: In inscriptions some divine epithet is prefixed to a

river name? Note also the use of the word "mediant" for "intermediate" (?) on page 115, line 26.

Excellent as this work is in so many ways, it has one feature, noticeable on every page, which many readers will regard as a very serious blemish,—extravagance in the use of conjecture. Of this, page 162, which I select almost at random, affords a moderate illustration. On this page the following words and phrases occur: "would probably lay claim" (l. 1), "were not likely to give" (l. 3), "were perhaps still regarded" (l. 6), "may have been" (l. 7), "points to divine pretensions" (l. 12), "was probably representative" (l. 13), "perhaps by Druids" (l. 16), "perhaps at one time" (l. 18), "may also have had" (l. 21), "Probably before cutting down the tree" (l. 24), "may explain" (ll. 26, 27). On page 205 occurs this series of conjectures: "The tree was perhaps cut down and burned; the oxen may have been incarnations of a god of vegetation, as the tree also may have been." Sometimes the author bases one conjecture on another; thus, on page 79: "This is probable, since the Gaulish god may have been a form of Dispatēr"; and again, on page 114: "... they may have been a supernatural folk, since their name is perhaps derived from *cōr*, 'dwarf,' and they are now regarded as mischievous fairies."

ALLISON EMERY DRAKE.

Westminster, Colorado.

THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH AND MODERN CRITICISM. By the Rev. J. IVERACH MUNRO. Pp. xxviii, 106. London: James Nisbet and Company, Ltd. 1911. 3s. 6d., *net*.

Among the arguments in favor of the conservative view of the Pentateuch, the problem of the Samaritan Pentateuch occupies an important place. It is well known that the Samaritans possess a Pentateuch, written in the old Phœnician characters, and that this is substantially identical with the Jewish five books of Moses. As it is obviously impossible for the Samaritans to have received their Pentateuch from their inveterate foes, and as this hostility can be traced back

to the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the question arises as to when they actually obtained their Pentateuch. If, according to the Critical School, the Priests' Code was being compiled and edited during and soon after the Exile, how was it that the Samaritans had the Pentateuch complete at this very date? These are some of the questions raised in the little book before us, which is commended by Dr. Orr in a brief but valuable introduction. Mr. Munro claims the Samaritan Pentateuch as a witness to the original Hebrew text, and this technical part of his book will doubtless receive from scholars the attention it demands and deserves. The more popular part which deals with the relation of the Samaritan Pentateuch to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch can be appreciated by all, and the author concludes that "there is just as much and just as little possibility of introducing a new Koran among Mohammedans to-day as there was of introducing a new Pentateuch in the time of Ezra" (p. 83). We have watched carefully for some years past for a thorough discussion of the Samaritan Pentateuch from the critical point of view, and we hope that Mr. Munro's book will compel some attention. Meanwhile we heartily indorse his closing words, that "the rising tide of evidence, palæological, philological, and historical, has swept away the dam erected with the materials of half-truths, misapprehensions, and sometimes sheer want of knowledge. The ocean-tide of truth is in, and will go no more out."

This is essentially a book to be placed among our witnesses to the trustworthiness of the Old Testament tradition.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

THE END OF THE LAW. By the Rev. M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D. Pp. xii, 191. London: Rivingtons. 1911. 5s., *net*.

The Warburton Lectures are an English foundation intended to support and confirm the Divine authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. This book represents the Lectures for the year 1907-11, and the purpose is to present the course of revelation to the Hebrews "as a dialectical process,

Vol. LXIX. No. 274. 12

in which the questions are formulated, by the experience of successive generations, and the answers are given by the prophets," until at length each dialogue ends with the final question asked by the last generation of Jews and answered by Jesus Christ. This is the meaning of the title of the book, that Jesus Christ is the goal of the Law. With this object in view, various great ideas like Providence, Personality, Sin, Atonement, Sacrifice, and Priesthood, are discussed in the light of the Old Testament and of their fulfilment in Christ. The Lectures are based entirely on an extreme critical view of the Old Testament; and, as Canon Glazebrook never gives his reasons, but simply takes the view for granted, it is impossible to argue as to the truth or falsity of his position. Generally speaking, he holds that no real revelation was granted to Israel on their emergence from Egypt, and it was only by very slow stages that the nation ascended into that higher realm which we find associated with the later prophets. The first figure of any reality is that of Moses, before whose time Canon Glazebrook can only speak of "the dim region of patriarchal legend" and of "a picture which has been repainted by so many different hands" (p. 15). Jehovah was originally a tribal God. There was no continuous Providence, no doctrine of the origin of evil, and no Providence for the individual (p. 18). A new age is said to have dawned in the ninth century, and Elijah and Elisha were the instruments of a loftier conception of religion. But even here we are told that "the story of their lives is confused by legends" (p. 19). We observe again that the view of revelation is "an eternal process of question and answer" (p. 24). The last chapters of Isaiah are dated at the time of Ezra, and are said to mark a rapid decline, with a picture of God as once more "the Man of War." This is due to Trito-Isaiah; and the Psalter as a whole, representing the period from the return to the second century, breathes the same spirit as that of Trito-Isaiah (pp. 30, 31). On the subject of Providence it is to the Book of Revelation, and not to the gospel of Christ, that we trace back the eschatology of the Mid-

dle Ages (p. 41). And we are informed that even now the Christian church as a whole has not attained to a full acknowledgment of God's providence as revealed by Christ (p. 42). By slow degrees Israel rose to the true level of thought about Personality, but it is only comparatively late that we have any distinct idea of this conception. And as to the hope of immortality, it was late in the third century when that dawned upon the Jews. Canon Glazebrook has evidently not given consideration to Dr. Sanday's forcible criticism of this point when reviewing "The Cambridge Biblical Essays" in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for January, 1910. How curious, too, to be told that while Israel stood before a locked door knocking in vain, Egypt, Greece, and Persia all held some doctrine of immortality (p. 58). It is difficult, to say the least, to know why these nations should have been so far in advance of one that is usually regarded as possessing unique elements of religious life and experience. Not even the New Testament is satisfactory to Canon Glazebrook, for we read of "the varying tradition of the Synoptic Gospels" in regard to the future life (p. 66), and also that St. Paul offers us "not a system of doctrine, but an inspiring process of conception." When we come to study the important subject of Sin, we find the modern view adopted which relegates the history of Adam's fall to the region of poetry, and speaks in the strongest terms against the Augustinian theory as expressed in the various Creeds and Confessions of the churches. "The Church of England is no better off than the rest, for her ninth Article involves all the main elements of the antiquated ecclesiastical dogma" (p. 72). There is scarcely any possibility of arriving at a Jewish doctrine before the ninth or eighth century B.C. (p. 75); and when we inquire as to the cause of Sin, "the earliest literary age of Israel answers unhesitatingly, 'God alone is the cause,'" the story of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart being the proof adduced for this. On Eschatology, also, the New Testament has no uniform message, for the Synoptic Gospels vary, and even in St. Paul there are three stages of belief (p. 113). After what has

been said, it can easily be understood that on such vital subjects as Atonement, Sacrifice, and Priesthood, Canon Glazebrook is very far from what is usually regarded as the true interpretation of Scripture language. Not only is Psalm cx. Maccabean, but the words "after the order of Melchisedec" seem to be considered as a corruption, "as many scholars believe" (p. 158). Everything is thus judged by Canon Glazebrook in the light of the great principle of evolution, and results of criticism are regarded as certain when it is perfectly well known that they are as open and uncertain as ever. As Dr. Sanday once remarked in his Bampton Lectures on a particular point of Old Testament Criticism, it is not wise to ignore the force of opposing arguments, because it is very like the discovery of a large army in the rear. We are not sorry to have the issues so clearly defined as they are in the book now before us. It is only another proof that, as Wellhausen says, the questions of the Old Testament are not literary, but religious. It is no mere difference of date, or even of authorship, but of religious and spiritual conceptions. In a recent number of the *Expositor*, Mr. Stanley A. Cook warns us against "insisting upon the Old Testament as an accurate or trustworthy record of the development of Hebrew history and religion." Canon Glazebrook's book is a striking illustration of the same tendency; for, if his book is correct, then the Old Testament is certainly most untrustworthy in its account of Israel's history and religion. It is this question of trustworthiness which is the main problem to-day. Some few years ago Dr. Burney of Oxford argued forcibly for the Mosaic date of the Ten Commandments, and, commenting on this, the editor of the *Expository Times* remarked, that if the Decalogue can be shown to come from Moses, or from his age, the present critical position on the early religion of Israel will have to be abandoned. And Professor Sellin of Vienna has expressed the opinion that it would be "timely for the masters of the Wellhausen school to revise once for all their old copy books and text books, and to admit the proposition: against the Mosaic religion of the Decalogue and the Book

of the Covenant no reasonable ground can be discovered." All this is either unknown to, or has been ignored by, Canon Glazebrook, but he must not expect others who are conversant with it to accept his view of Israel's religion, as though it were beyond question. As we studied his book we could not help wondering what Bishop Warburton would think if he could read these pages and find in them so absolute a surrender of the very position for which he founded the Lectures. Quite apart from any specific doctrine of Divine Inspiration, we maintain that Dr. Glazebrook's view of Israel's religion is unwarranted, both by everything we know from the Old Testament itself, and also by reason of an ever-increasing mass of scholarly material.

W. H. G. T.

THE MAKING OF THE BIBLE. By ALBERT E. DUNNING, D.D. 12mo. Pp. x, 191. Boston, New York, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 1911. 75 cents, *net*.

The author of this book, being no critic himself, blindly accepts the Wellhausen theory of the Old Testament, and through the Congregational Publishing Society imposes those views as infallibly correct upon the unsophisticated religious public. It is another instance of the blind leading the blind.

WHAT ABOUT THE OLD TESTAMENT? Is it Played out? By Rev. ANDREW CRAIG ROBINSON, M.A., Rector of Ballymoney, Co. Cork. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 188. London: Marshall Brothers, Ltd.

A beautiful illustrated volume, discussing with great ability and rare skill: "The Bearing of Recent Oriental Discoveries on Old Testament History"; "Some Peculiarities of the Pentateuch"; "The Ritual of the Sacrifices"; "Psalm CX. A Psalm of David"; "Certain Words in the Book of Daniel asserted by the Critics to be Proof that it was Composed at a Late Period"; "The Cuneiform Records and the Fall of Babylon"; "Darius the Median and the Cyropædia of Xenophon"; "Nebuchadnezzar and the Book of Daniel."

The maps and illustrations are admirably chosen, and the

whole work constitutes a most important defense of the historical character of the Old Testament, and will prove of equal value both to the scholar and the popular reader. In the chapter on the crossing of the Red Sea, however, we think he is in error in following Naville in fixing the place north of the Bitter Lakes, rather than south of them (cf. Wright's *Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History*, pp. 83-117).

THE ANTIQUITY OF HEBREW WRITING AND LITERATURE; OR, Problems in Pentateuchal Criticism. By ALVIN SYLVESTER ZERBE, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Criticism and Theology in the Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio. 8vo. Pp. xxiv, 297. Cleveland, Ohio: Central Publishing House. 1911. \$1.50.

The name of this book is suggestive of technicalities, and the author has, indeed, met every requirement for a technical study of the subject; but he has written in such fashion that what might have been a very dry discussion has become a charming narrative of the whole literature of the subject. The book is as interesting as a novel.

The author has set the various opinions on this subject before the reader with the utmost simplicity and clearness, and with an impartiality that is most gratifying, and in such an orderly way as to give a most comprehensive view. At the same time his own opinion, though not obtrusive, is clear. Specialists will find in the book an epitome of the facts and opinions from the earliest times to the present in the most convenient form for reference, the student who wishes information will scarcely find it anywhere else within the same compass, and the general reader who seeks only impressions will get correct ones.

The sharp antagonism between two or three distinct camps of Old Testament scholars makes it impossible for any man to write on this subject in such a way that his own views will have general acceptance. Professor Zerbe's book will be sharply criticized. His inclination toward the acceptance of

the Egyptian origin of the Phœnician alphabet will have many strong opponents, though the consensus of both classical and modern authors, in general, sustains his view. His optimism in hoping to mediate between traditionalism and modernism in the interpretation of Old Testament literature is refreshing, even if one cannot share in it.

Professor Zerbe is not quite certain of the origin of Hebrew writing and literature, a state of mind which most accurately reflects the existing knowledge on the subject. Altogether this is a most satisfying book.

M. G. KYLE.

Philadelphia, Pa.

THE BEATITUDES AND THE CONTRASTS. By HUBERT FOSTON, M.A., D.Litt. Pp. 192. Boston and Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 1911.

The author calls this "A Study in Methodic Interpretation." He believes that the Beatitudes have a peculiar symmetry, and that, somehow or other, expositors do not seem to have realized "what a high and exquisite form of organic unity they compose." The book is marked by genuine scholarly ability and great spiritual and exegetical insight. It comes from a very thoughtful and close student of Scripture. There is a freshness of treatment which is truly helpful, and whether we follow the author in every detail or not, we cannot help feeling that he has shed definite light on the structure and relationship of these sayings of our Lord. We have read the book with real enjoyment, and we believe it is one that all Bible students should note.

W. H. G. T.

THE TRIAL OF OUR FAITH. By THOMAS HODGKIN, D.C.L. Pp. viii, 344. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. \$2.50, *net*.

A collection of twelve Lectures and Essays by a well-known Quaker scholar, mainly addressed to his fellow-members of the Society of Friends. The first Essay gives the title to the rest, and among the others are: "The Central

Mystery of Christianity," "Predestination," "The Epistle to the Galatians," "Early Christian Worship," "The Epistles of Ignatius," "The Prospects of English Protestantism," and "George Fox." On these, and the other subjects, Dr. Hodgkin has something to say that is well worthy of careful attention. The testimonies to Christ and the Holy Spirit are as clear as they are welcome. On the question of Predestination, the teaching seems to us inadequate; while the reference to Jonathan Edwards and infants a span long in hell is one of those instances in which even scholarly and thoughtful writers are content to pass on traditions without verifying them. The view taken of election is national; but it is surely impossible to limit St. Paul's teaching in this way, especially when, by a curious attitude of mind, the idea of national election is extended from Israel to other nations, and even to the entire race. This is to confuse the issues, and to rob the idea of election of any meaning whatever. We are afraid that Dr. Hodgkin's treatment does not really face the fundamental problem. On "Early Christian Worship" the comments are characteristic of the Quaker attitude, and eminently worth attention from members of other churches. The sketch of "The Epistles of Ignatius" is a popular treatment, and has some useful suggestions about various methods of church government. The Essay on English Protestantism is decidedly good, and its criticisms of Newman and the Oxford Movement are much to the point. The recent publication of Newman's Life adds special force to Dr. Hodgkin's comments. Very truly does he remark that when looking at Newman's portrait it is impossible to feel that the gospel was to him really "glad tidings"; on the contrary, the predominant emotion was fear lest, after all, he should be lost. As may be expected, these Essays are not all of equal value, and in one or two of them Dr. Hodgkin seems to be on somewhat unfamiliar ground; but his attitude of "sweet reasonableness" and his fresh outlook on life make his pages very enjoyable and profitable reading. We are glad to have the comments of so spiritual and true-sighted a thinker. W. H. G. T.

THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE: A Study of the Resurrection and Ascension Narratives in the Gospels, and of the Threefold Version in the Acts of Christ's Appearance to Saul on the Way to Damascus. (Christian Faith and Doctrine Series.) By G. HANSON, M.A., D.D. 12mo. Pp. xi, 372. London: National Council of Evangelical Free Churches.

Dr. Hanson has produced a most timely and satisfactory volume, adapted both to the establishing of faith and to the quickening of religious life. In the first half of the volume the author answers the objections which have been raised to the bodily resurrection of Christ. These are met in detail and in a most satisfactory manner. Freed thus from pester-ing doubts, the reader can unreservedly yield himself to the inspiration of the various scenes in which Christ appeared to his disciples. The volume deserves a very wide circulation.

THE PHILOCALIA OF ORIGEN: A Compilation of Selected Passages from Origen's Works made by St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. Basil of Cæsarea. Translated into English by the Rev. GEORGE LEWIS, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford; M.A., University of London; Rector of Icomb, Gloucestershire; late Vicar of Dodderhill, Droitwich; author of "A Life of Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter and Norwich," "An Oxford Parish Priest"; translator of S. Basil's "De Spiritu Sancto," S. Jerome's "Dogmatic Treatises," etc. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 242. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1911.

"The Philocalia of Origen" are specially valuable "as preserving to us in the original much of Origen's work which would otherwise have been entirely lost, or would have survived only in the translations of Rufinus." Even the great work against Celsus is in large part preserved in this book, thus representing a much earlier manuscript than that of the thirteenth century, from which the ordinary translation is made. The volume forms an excellent introduction to the study of Origen, and will be specially acceptable to those who do not have his complete works. A perusal of it will increase the general appreciation of the mental capacity of the early defenders of Christianity.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE IN THE NICENE AND ATHANASIAN CREEDS: A Study in Theological Definition. By WILLIAM SAMUEL BISHOP, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology and Metaphysics in the University of the South. 12mo. Pp. 85. New York, London, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 75 cents, *net*.

This volume is commended to such as are accustomed to reject the Nicene Creed because of its psychological crudities and logical contradictions. The supposed logical contradictions are shown by Dr. Bishop to arise from attempting to interpret the language of the Eastern Church in the language of Western or Augustinian conceptions. "There is no contradiction between the Trinitarian thought of St. Augustine and that of St. Athanasius: not because their Trinitarian teaching is precisely identical, but because the two theologies (though closely related) move upon distinct planes, and for this very reason do not clash with each other" (p. 28). In these times of theological decadence this little volume supplies an imperative want. The author's remarks upon the Trinity as interpreted in Christian experience are specially helpful.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY. By W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, Wycliffe College, Toronto; formerly Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 432. London, New York, Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton. 1912. \$3.00, *net*.

This most instructive and helpful homiletical volume is born both of prolonged pastoral experience and of profound study not only of the wants of society, but of the Bible in all its aspects. In Part I. it treats, in four chapters, of the ministry of the Prophets, of the Twelve, of St. Paul, and of the Pastoral Epistles. Part II. is filled with helpful suggestions concerning the infinite number of details that fall to the work of the Christian minister, more especially in the Episcopal Church. In Part III., Dr. Thomas treats of "the bearing of the man on the work and of the work on the man." The vol-

ume commends itself in every respect to the ministry of every denomination. Nonconformist ministers will be specially helped by the introduction it will give them to the more orderly methods and the richer devotional services of the established English Church.

The book is furnished with a remarkably full bibliography and with indexes of subjects and Scripture passages.

THE PRESENT DAY PROBLEM OF CRIME as related to Prisons and Prison Discipline, the Administration of Criminal Law, and to the Labors of Philanthropists for the Prevention of Crime and Reformation of Criminals. By ALBERT H. CURRIER. 12mo. Pp. 179. Boston: Richard G. Badger. 1912. \$1.00, *net*.

Two or three of the Essays which form this volume have already appeared in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA*. From the interest elicited by these Essays in the course of their publication, it seemed important to have them collected in due order for the development of the subject, and completed by the addition of a most interesting chapter on the Earl of Shaftesbury, whose work stands out as a most prominent illustration of the saving power of philanthropy when embodied in a noble life. Every one will welcome the painstaking studies of the subject which appear in this compact and well-written volume. The subjects treated are: "The Problem of Crime"; "A Century of Progress in Prison Reform"; "Crime in the United States: Reforms Demanded"; "The Saving Power of Philanthropy"; "Anthony Ashley Cooper, The Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury."

A COUNTRY PARISH: Ancient Parsons and Modern Incidents. By FRANK SAMUEL CHILD, author of "An Old New England Town," "An Unknown Patriot," etc. Pp. ix, 251. New York, Boston, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. \$1.25, *net*.

If this admirable collection of incidents relating to country parishes should have the effect, as it is admirably adapted to do, of leading more of our seminary graduates to seek par-

ishes in the country rather than in the city, it would serve a most important purpose. After all, it is the country churches that serve as fountains from which the city churches receive their perennial supply of most active members.

THE PILGRIMS OF IOWA. By TRUMAN O. DOUGLASS. Pp. xiii, 422. Boston, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. \$2.00, *net*.

An ideal local history, of special interest to citizens of Iowa, but scarcely less interesting and important to every one who would know the story of the laying of the foundations of our Republic in the self-denial of countless noble men and women. The author, by long association with the Congregational churches of Iowa, is eminently fitted for the task, and has accomplished his work in a way that places it above criticism.

THE MODERN MAN'S RELIGION. By CHARLES REYNOLDS BROWN, author of "The Cap and the Gown," "Faith and Health," "The Young Man's Affairs," etc. 12mo. Pp. viii, 166. Boston, New York, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 1911. \$1.00, *net*.

This volume consists of five lectures before the students of Columbia University. With the exception of a few misleading dogmatic assertions, which are contrary to fact, concerning the results of modern criticism of the Old Testament, this volume is highly to be recommended.

THE LIFE OF DR. D. K. PEARSONS, Friend of the Small College and of Missions. By EDWARD F. WILLIAMS. 8vo. Pp. xi, 308. New York, Boston, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. 1911. \$1.25, *net*.

Mr. Pearson was born on a farm in Vermont in 1820. Without an extended education he drifted into lucrative business about thirty years after, with his residence at Chicago. With conscientious fidelity he has distributed his large fortune of more than three million dollars to aid the smaller Christian colleges of the country, leaving himself barely enough to live comfortably through the remainder of his life. This simple,

straightforward story of his work is not only interesting, but is well calculated to inspire others to go and do likewise.

CALVIN WILSON MATEER, *Forty-five Years a Missionary in Shantung, China*. By DANIEL W. FISHER. 8vo. Pp. viii, 334. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press. 1911. \$1.50, *net*.

A biography of one of the most successful Presbyterian missionaries in China, intensely interesting in itself, but specially so in view of the present crisis in that empire.

THE MAKERS AND TEACHERS OF JUDAISM. From the Fall of Jerusalem to the Death of Herod the Great. (The Historical Bible.) By CHARLES FOSTER KENT, Ph.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. With Maps and Charts. 12mo. Pp. xiii, 323. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1911. \$1.00, *net*.

The discredited theories of the Wellhausen critics respecting the origin of the Pentateuch discount the value of everything which they write respecting the history of the Jewish nation. In this volume, as in most of the others of Dr. Kent, he injects without any qualifications his dogmatic conclusions concerning the late origin of the so-called priestly document analyzed out of the Pentateuch, and the various other hypothetical statements concerning the Pentateuch. The unsuspecting pupils who are invited to take this as a textbook will be led into byways of speculation from which they will extricate themselves only by a painful process of original investigation.

THE QUAKERS IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES. By RUFUS M. JONES, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of Philosophy, Haverford College. Assisted by ISAAC SHARPLESS, D.Sc., President of Haverford College, and AMELIA M. GUMMERE, author of "The Quaker—a Study in Costume." 8vo. Pp. xxxii, 580. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1911. \$3.50, *net*.

The history of Quakerism is fundamental to the understanding not only of the religious but the social and political

movements in America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. From 1656 to 1780 Quakerism grew and flourished in the Colonies. In England the fact of a state church necessarily kept Quakers out of politics and compelled them to a life apart. In America there were no such obstacles, and from their writings they evidently expected their ideas to prevail.

One Quaker, John Archdale, was prominent in helping form three Colonies — Maine and North and South Carolina. He was elected to Parliament in 1698; but, as he could not take the oath, he lost his seat. Neither in Puritan Colonies nor in Virginia could they vote or hold office; but in Rhode Island the case was different, and for some years Quakers were in office, and for thirty-six years different members held the office of Governor. Of course in Pennsylvania they had matters in their own hands, and the same was true for many years in New Jersey; while until 1701 they were the only organized religious body in North Carolina. By the middle of the eighteenth century there were more Quakers in the New World than in Great Britain. These people were thrifty, quiet citizens, and probably did much more than they have ever been credited with in preparing the way for the wonderful development of the country which has followed.

The collision between the two exponents of religious freedom, the Puritan and the Quaker, was most fully shown in Massachusetts. They both sprang from common motives — a hatred of tyranny, an abhorrence of sacerdotalism, and antagonism against the “pleasures” of life — and they were both possessed with a “passion for righteousness”; but here their likeness ended. The types of religion which they represented were so different that it could easily be seen they were irreconcilable. The one depended on authority, on a revelation which had been made, and which depended only upon its believers for transmission. Beyond this, nothing had or could be given. Of course this view implied the necessity of teachers specially drilled and trained for the service; hence, in a sense, a priesthood, with special privileges

and knowledge. The other side held to an open dispensation, a never-ending revelation, dependent only on the individual's keeping an open mind to the operations and influence of the Spirit of God acting directly on this receptive mind. Thus the Quaker minister of that period was a real prophet who spoke as the Spirit directed. It is not strange that these two types found it impossible to live at peace with each other.

Another strange fact is, that as soon as these collisions ceased the Quaker apparently lost his power of impressing the world with the truth as he saw it. The question naturally arises, Why was this? Our author feels that one strong reason was because the early Quakers allowed themselves to feel that it was required of them to be a "peculiar people," holding a vessel of sacred truth; and, insidious as the idea was, it immediately began a work of narrowing and contracting the nature in which it worked. The common bond of nature which holds humanity together must not be severed if the good is to be communicated. Jesus emphasized that very plainly when he bore down so hard upon the Pharisees. No man in this world is singled out for absolutely unique suffering, either mental or spiritual, any more than for absolutely unique experiences, ecstatic or prophetic. The common bond forces a certain likeness in experiences. For this reason, an aloofness of Quaker, Catholic, Brahman, or Saint Simeon Stylites has failed, no matter how honestly entered upon.

A second cause for the decline of the vitality in the Society is held to be due to the fact that the Quaker of that period thought of himself as a vehicle through which the Divine Voice was heard, not that he should keep himself at the nearest highest point his being was capable of, and by the coöperation of the Divine Spirit really be a revelator. This conception led him to feel that the instrumentality was unnatural, thus neglecting the proper or fullest expansion of his individuality, and by this neglect cutting himself off from the possibility of fully coping with persons of wider culture. All this led more and more to a further withdrawing into narrower lines.

The Revolutionary War led to a great awakening, and great results have followed; but, in the author's view, it came too late for the Quakers to achieve, in the civilization of this century, the place which their beginning promised. The question is an open one, whether the Quaker has come to this awakening too late to make him the force now to which the value of his fundamental ideas would entitle him. There can be no question but that their type of religion has, in each generation, produced saints; and if it can do that repeatedly, it must have in it immense vitality.

F. B. W.

**American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia, Boston,
Chicago, St. Louis, Toronto, Can.**

INDIA AND DAILY LIFE IN BENGAL. By Rev. Z. F. GRIFFIN, B.D., Fifteen Years a Missionary in India. Third Edition. 12mo. Pp. 214. \$1.00, *net*.

**Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, Toronto,
London, and Edinburgh.**

THE RELIGION OF CHRIST: An Interpretation. By FREDERICK D. KERSHNER, M.A., President of Milligan College. 12mo. Pp. 159. \$1.00, *net*.

The Pilgrim Press, Boston, New York, Chicago.

"BLUE SKY." The Life of Harriet Caswell-Broad. By JOSEPH BOURNE CLARK, D.D., author of "Leavening the Nation." 12mo. Pp. ix, 238.

The Sunday School Times Company, Philadelphia.

A VOICE IN THE NIGHT and Other Stories. By FREDERICK HALL. 12mo. Pp. 194. \$1.00, *net*.

HISTORICAL CHARTS OF THE LIFE AND MINISTRY OF CHRIST. With an Outline Harmony of the Gospels. By GEORGE E. GROSCUP, B.A. Royal 8vo. Pp. 40. \$1.00, *net*.

THE STUDENTS' ILLUSTRATED HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND. By the Rev. WILLIAM WALTER SMITH, A.M., A.B., M.D. Crown 8vo. Pp. xxi, 109. 75 cents, *net*.

WORLD-WIDE BIBLE STUDY. By CLAYTON SEDGWICK COOPER, Secretary for Bible Study, Student Department of the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations. 12mo. Pp. x, 234. \$1.00, *net*.

The Ice Age in North America and Its Bearing Upon the Antiquity of Man

By G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

**New Thoroughly Revised and Greatly Enlarged (5th)
Edition. 200 Illustrations, 800 Pages. 8vo. cloth,
\$5.00 net; postage, 25 cents.**

"This 'Ice Age in North America' I regard as one of the treasures of my book shelves."—SIR ROBERT BAILL.

"The lucid presentation of the subject has made it popular among students, and it is the most convenient compendium in existence of the features of the glacial period."—Professor CHARLES M. HERRING.

"The book meets the demand of both popular interest and a scientific accuracy."—*Daily Pressman* (New Orleans).

"The volume is a classic in this field of geology, and the new edition, printed in good, clear type, on the very best of paper, will be welcomed by geologists throughout the world."—*San Francisco Bulletin*.

"No specialist in geology in any part of the world ever thinks of being without this book, which is now in its fifth edition, greatly enlarged, revised up to the latest contribution to the science."—*Journal of Education*.

"The whole subject is an immense one, and Dr. Wright has dealt with it out of a full and patient mind."—*Contemporary Review*.

"One of the most important scientific publications of the present year. . . . The volume should be given a place in every important public and school library."—*Springfield Republican*.

"The book is profusely illustrated by photographs, maps and diagrams and should make a special appeal to all geological students."—*London Daily News*.

Bibliotheca Sacra Company
OBERLIN, OHIO

THE JULY, 1912

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATING EDITOR

FRANK H. FOSTER, JAMES LINDSAY, CHARLES F. THWING, NEWELL DWIGHT
 KILLS, A. S. BIRLE, WILLIAM C. HARTON, HENRY A. STIMSON
 GEORGE W. MADDEN, A. S. EDDY, MELVIN G. RYLE
 W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS

CONTENTS

THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	- A. Töpelberg	377
REASONABLE BIBLICAL CRITICISM	- W. H. Griffith Thomas	409
THE SADDUCEAN CHRISTIANS OF DAMASCUS	- A. Margenau	421
THE MINISTRY OF PAIN (II)	- Edward M. Marvine	433
TWO NEW VOLUMES OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY	- Harold M. Wiener	449
CHRISTIANITY AND THE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM	- David Finley Boyer	459
THE HISTORY OF THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AND ITS NEWER REPRESENTATION	- Eduard Friedrich Künig	513
CRITICAL NOTE		527
Paul's Transformation in Character	- Howell M. Hayden	622
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS		627
TACTICS OF THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW		647
SHADES OF THE STOREWALL REGIMENT	- Gabriel Campbell	659

OBERLIN, OHIO, U. S. A.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

BRISTOL AVENUE, CHANNING HEIGHTS & SON
 25, Farringdon Street, London, E. C.

SINGLE NUMBER, 75 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$2.50

Entered at the Post Office in Oberlin as second-class matter.

The Origin of the Pentateuch

A Compact Defense of the Moslem Authorship, in Popular Form.

By HAROLD M. WISNER, M.A., LL.D.

186 pages, 8vo. paper. 50 cents, postpaid.

Mr. Wisner's opinions and articles "are a successful attack on the critical views now current."—*Dr. William J. Macdonell*.

"His plan . . . is supported by facts, reasoning, and learning which will win it in a most respectful and attentive hearing."—*Professor James Oak*.

By the same author

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism

Considers the Detailed Discussion of the Points made in the More Popular Presentation.

255 pages, 8vo. cloth. \$1.50, postpaid.

"A mass of learned observation and argument which cannot be disregarded."—*The Very Reverend Henry Ware, D.D., Dean of Canterbury*.

"The decision of a jurist like Mr. Wisner is of great value where the origin and meaning of laws are concerned."—*The Tablet (London)*.

MIRACLE AND SCIENCE

How Miracles Estimated by the Analysis of the Rules and Tests of the Science of Jurisprudence as Administered To-day in Courts of Justice

By FRANCIS J. LAMB, Attorney and Counsellor at Law

250 pages, 12mo, cloth. \$1.50, net; postpaid, 12 cents.

"It is long since the reviewer read so strong and satisfying a book."

—*Professor WILLIAM HERBERT GREENE, Jr.*

Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History

By G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E.

Second Edition. Parts Illustrated; 450 pages, 12mo, cloth. \$2.00, net; postpaid, 12 cents.

"For a long time to come every one who has to write upon the history or touch that wider subject of the attitude of the Old Testament to the phenomena of nature, will require to know what is written in this book."—*The Glasgow Herald*.

By the same author

The Ice Age in North America

New Harbinger, revised and slightly enlarged (1891), 340 pages. Two hundred illustrations, 200 pages, 8vo. cloth. \$2.00, net; postage, 5 cents.

"Its vivid presentation of the subject has made it popular among students, and it is the best accessible compendium in reference of the features of the glacial period."—*Professor GEORGE R. BRONKHORST*.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, Oberlin, Ohio

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY THE REVEREND A. TROELSTRA, D.D., MINISTER: REFORMED
CHURCH, THE HAGUE, NETHERLANDS.

[Lecture I. Translated by the Reverend John H. de Vries, D.D., Rector: Grace Church, Saybrook, Conn. This lecture, delivered in a course at the University of Leyden, with the volume by the author noticed in later pages of this Number, is but one of the many indications of the return of Old Testament critics to the maintenance of conservative views. The critical views of Kuenen are no longer maintained by his successors at Leyden. The all-too-prevalent Wellhausen assumptions are being now more and more discredited in the Fatherland, and it is to be hoped that his British and American followers may have their eyes opened to the anachronism of still maintaining his views of the Pentateuch. To continue to impose them upon the Christian public as the incontrovertible results of scholarship is coming to be little less than criminal.—EDITOR.]

ALL scientific investigation searches after unity. It views its object from all sides until it has seen it as a whole. That there is a unity in every object which presents itself to scientific consideration; that there is unity in the many-sorted complexity of things and of phenomena which we call the world,—that, in other words, the world is not a chaos but a cosmos, is the supposition, uttered or unexpressed, the *conditio sine qua non*, of all scientific effort.

Vol. LXIX. No. 275. 1

Because of his creation after the image of God, there is an unquenchable thirst in man, even in his fallen estate, to see the universe, the earth, man, history, and everything that is found in the domain of culture, and especially the world of religious phenomena, and to grasp it as one thought, one divine work; not as an accidentally gathered collection of disparate objects or phenomena, but as one whole and one unit.

Whatever valid objections may be raised against the doctrine of evolution, Darwin's hypothesis shows that the human mind cannot rest until it has grasped its given object of study as a unit.

From this it cannot be inferred that every search after unity moves in the right track. Anticipation has once been called the essence of sin; and, if anywhere, it is in the domain of science that this is frequently evident. The searcher there will often claim that he *understands*, and takes in as a whole, what he has not yet fully *grasped*. A theory is then constructed which, because it suddenly throws an unexpected light upon certain thus-far puzzling problems, glitters for a little while. But it is soon evident that the facts did not press the theory upon the investigator, but that the theory was pressed upon the facts. Take, for instance, the "religionsgeschichtliche" method. This method, of which Dr. Troeltsch¹ is perhaps the most talented spokesman, aims to view the religious life of humanity as a whole, and tries to do this by interpreting everything related to religion, first of all, as a something immanent. All ideas and powers which appear in Christendom as products of a divine activity are produced, according to this theory, by humanity itself. Humanity is the author of the conceptions: revelation, the supernatural, miracle, history of salvation. Humanity is the mother of the organs of so-called revelation. Jesus Christ is the product of

humanity. No mention is tolerated of a divine inworking or of an incarnation of the divine Word.

By this method, moreover, the history of religion is interpreted as a gradually continuing development ever unfolding itself in higher forms. In the ascending scale of these forms, Christendom takes its place, perhaps even the highest. But when "religionsgeschichtlich" Christendom is called the highest form of religion, it is that only relatively.

For this is the third and most remarkable trait of this method in question, which trait is connected with the two already noted, viz. that it recognizes only such phenomena and "Werte" as, because development has no bounds, are presently surpassed again by others. From the viewpoint of this method nothing is absolute: everything is only relative.

It needs no demonstration that the consistent maintenance of these principles turns religion into something which is entirely subjective [innerweltliches], so that, at length, nothing more can be said of religion in the real sense of the word. Everything connected with religion becomes, then, a subdivision of psychology, and, except as it has been incorporated into the literary and medical faculties, the whole theological faculty is bound to disappear.

But before we draw conclusions let us consider the laws whereby the writer of the history of religions works. Troeltsch² names three: criticism, analogy, and correlation.

By analogy is understood that the criterion of the probability of an event lies in its agreement with the normal, the common, or at least with what has frequently taken place. Kuenen³ goes out from this analogy when he writes: "To that which may be called the general or at least common rule, that religion begins with fetichism, develops later on into polytheism, and

thus only ascends to monotheism,—if indeed this highest step is reached,—to this rule the Semites also make no exception.” But where do we find this rule? This rule is formulated outside of Israel and Christendom, and then the history of these two must conform to it.⁴

By correlation is understood that there is an unlimited reciprocal influence between all phenomena of life, so that a change at a given point indicates a preceding movement at another point, which brings with it a succeeding modification at a third point. With everything that happens one thing stands continually in closest connection with the other, so that everything that happens forms one coherent chain.

And by criticism this method understands that in the domain of history there is room only for the judgment of probabilities. Thus with regard to every tradition it must first be asked, How high a degree of probability belongs to it? This renders each fact viewed by itself uncertain; and that alone is certain the operation of which we observe in the present. It makes the relation between religious faith and independent facts very indefinite, and it becomes impossible to build religious faith on the ground of one definite fact; for it is never immediately related therewith.⁵

You realize how much remains of what the Scriptures declare when the writer of the history of religion lays it upon his procrustean bed. Everything must be cut off which, according to the Scriptures of both Old and New Testaments, happened only once, since with what happened only once “no degree of probability can be ascertained.” That which happened only once is, according to this method, *per se*, an improbable something. Miracle must be cut off, since, by virtue of analogy, there need be no absolute uniformity in everything that happens, but a very definite oneness of sort

is required, and miracle falls outside of this. In "Das Wesen der Religion,"⁶ Professor Bousset declares: "In this world (in which, as is supposed, everything that happens finds its interpretation in itself, where all natural and spiritual happenings take place after general laws and rules), there is, apparently, no longer room for what happens only once, such as miracle strictly taken, as a Divine interference in the natural happenings of the world by suspension of its laws." Again, all divine inworking must be cut off, since where all happenings stand together in coherence, no interference from without the world is thinkable. Christ himself must be understood as a mere link in the chain of immanent world-happenings. Hence there is no Christ, the Son of God.⁷

This does not mean to say that all adherents of the "religionsgeschichtliche" method, and those who apply it, are enemies of Christianity. Many of them face the Christian religion not merely with a friendly smile of keen scientific appreciation, but even desire, in the very accurate words of Professor Hunzinger,⁸ "to be timely apologetes of Christianity," in that they try to show that religion and Christianity are possible even without supernaturalism, upon the foundation of immanent evolutionistic thought, in order that they may prevent the chasm between modern culture and Christianity from becoming unbridgeable. Many of them desire merely to clear away the barrier of what they call "ecclesiastical theology" between Christianity and the other religions, and bravely raise the banner of religion in the face of all naturalism and positivism. But in this very inconsistency the "religionsgeschichtliche" method reveals its weakness and its insufficiency. When religion must be honored as something independent, something *sui generis* in the midst of all other

psychological and historical phenomena, why should not Christianity be recognized as something special in the midst of other religions, as something which differs from all the others not merely in degree but also in principle? When in the religious domain divine revelation, in however vague a sense, is acknowledged as a reality, why with regard to Israel and Christianity should we not be permitted to speak of a special revelation?

From the above-mentioned inconsistency it is clearly evident that in the domain of religion this method cannot say the last word. It is easy to speak of analogy, of correlation and development, but in this method one looks in vain for an objective standard by which to estimate analogy, or for an infallible means by which to show the coherence between two phenomena, or for a true standard of worth by which to place in order the several phenomena in the scale of development. Behind and above this method stands the conviction of hearts, the faith; and thus with all scientific work this question comes to the fore as fundamental: From what viewpoint of faith do you start out in your search after unity?

When one declares that he stands upon the confession of the Church of the Reformation, there are many not only among modernists; but also among the orthodox, who are ready at once on scientific ground to call this an untenable aprioristic position. He who in his studies starts out from a confession, it is said, determines in advance the result that is to be reached. What I have said of the "religionsgeschichtliche" method, by way of introduction, will have shown you that to every investigator the result is determined in advance in this sense indeed, that, though he may not acknowledge it to himself, he never appears before the object of investigation as a *tabula rasa*, but with a definite apprecia-

tion. But his appreciation need not be viewed as a prejudice, from which escape is impossible, and which is more or less of a hindrance. On the contrary, it must be viewed as the leading motive in all study. Where there is nothing but scepticism, — if such a disposition of soul is possible — there is no more investigation; or, if there is investigation, no result is found because no result is desired. Hence study is not the weighing of facts in the neutral balance of passionless tracings according to the mathematical rules of infallible methods, in order in the end to separate the grains of truth from the pounds and ounces of error, — on the contrary, study is a search impelled by the logos within us after the logos outside us.⁹ What by faith we have seen as eternal reality we are impelled, as by an inner necessity, to regard as such in all things.

Hence the protest which at all times has been raised by the Church of the Reformed Confession against the domineering tendency in the domain of Bible study. And if it seemed at times that the protest was but the result of secret fear, and of ignorance of the task of criticism, so that many looked down with pitying smiles upon those who were thought to view the Bible as a book that had fallen from heaven; nevertheless, that protest at heart had a wider and deeper tendency. It reacted against the unscientific self-sufficiency of the current scientific method. The Church felt that no method could ever determine what actually happened; and the radical error which dominated the investigation of the Old Testament was that the work was not purely literary, but that, while apparently unwilling to have anything to do with any dogmatism, it was nevertheless itself as dogmatic as possible; only with this difference that its dogmatism was for the most part far removed from the confession of the

Church. In the words of Professor Hunzinger, "The real grounds of this antithesis must be sought in a wholly different relation to the Christian truth of salvation; while, in the second place, the method only serves to give this antithesis a rational foundation."¹⁰ When, therefore, in this lecture, I call your attention to the organic unity of the Old Testament, it is not my plan, in a hairsplitting way, to refute the results of historic-critical investigation; but, first of all, to try to place you at a viewpoint of this part of the Holy Scripture other than that of the ordinary training, and to make it plain to you that there is another viewpoint which scientifically is not ridiculous, not less worthy but quite equally justifiable [gleichberechtigtes]. Just now I will say no more, although I should. For there are no two equally justifiable viewpoints for regarding an object of scientific investigation. One stands—even if, on account of human weakness, always defectively—either at the only true viewpoint, or one does not. If this applies in general, it presses in particular when we engage ourselves with Holy Writ.

The object of our investigation is that part of Holy Scripture which, with St. Paul, we call the Old Covenant (2 Cor. iii. 14: *ἡ παλαια διαθηκη*). For more than two and a quarter centuries the study of the Old Testament moved in a direction which was taken because scholars assumed a different attitude toward the Holy Scripture from that of the church alive by faith in Christ. The philosophers Hobbes (*Leviathan*, vol. iii. p. 33) and Spinoza (*Tractatus theologico-politicus*, chaps. vi-x.) gave being to the so-called higher criticism. This very circumstance should render every unbiased investigator doubly cautious, lest he be decoyed into the track marked out by them. Isaac de la Peyrère, who in

1655 published anonymously his strange book "*Systema Theologicum ex Præadamitarum Hypothesi*," which was a literary investigation of the Pentateuch, was a Huguenot, but later he went over to the Romish Church. Richard Simon¹¹ was a member of the congregation of the Oratory, whose natural and spiritual tendency was wholly rationalistic.¹²

Of course whatever is presented within the domain of science must be viewed by itself. But when judgment is passed regarding the Scripture, it should be known what viewpoint in general the man occupies who pronounces the judgment. As regards the criticism of the Pentateuch, its birth is generally known. Jean Astruc (1684-1766), the court physician of Louis XIV., was led by his study of the history of syphilis and other diseases incident to this to investigate the laws of Moses. The interchangeable use of the godnames Elohim and Jahve suggested to him that in the writing of Genesis Moses made use of several original documents. In 1753 he made the hypothesis known in his celebrated book anonymously published in Brussels. It has often been said that the criticism of the Pentateuch was born from Apologetics. Wrote Professor Wildeboer: "An enthusiastic apologete gave the investigators the dissecting-knife in hand by which they were enabled to divide the great historic work into its original component parts."¹³ But here, also, a somewhat closer scrutiny is needed. For Astruc himself writes that he hesitated to publish his work "for fear that the so-called freethinkers who make a support of everything for their assertions would abuse it for the sake of undermining the authority of the Pentateuch." Hence he did not appear against, but in spite of, the freethinkers, and he felt that his well-intended work in their hands might become a weapon against the authority of the Scripture. Astruc, therefore,

did not feel himself by any means called to apologetic activity. And when we recall that he was a Roman Catholic whose father at the revocation of the edict of Nantes had abandoned his Protestant faith; that he stood under the influence of the Jesuits; when, furthermore, we keep in mind that the Roman Catholics have always held an entirely different attitude toward the Scriptures than the Protestants; that, in the last instance, faith to them does not rest upon the Word of God, but upon the church; so that in their study of the Scriptures they have always gone to work more or less rationalistically, we must be on our guard before we follow this Jesuitical physician in his dissecting work. Says Dr. Hoedemaker:¹⁴ "By his hypothesis, Astruc aimed simultaneously at the Protestant and the scorner of his day; while his Jesuitical ready wit laid a snare for Protestant scholars which they . . . do not seem yet to have discovered." These particulars need to be remembered that it may be clear that the very first beginnings of the view of the Old Testament which in many ways is current in our times should warn us not to be too ready to agree with what is offered us as a result of pure, unprejudiced scientific investigation.

But some one may say, that, apart from every intention with which he wrote his book, the thing itself to which Astruc called the common attention was true. Let me consider this objection for a moment: first, because it gives me an opportunity to combat an opinion which prevents many people from placing themselves at the proper viewpoint; and, again, because it will help us realize something of the organic unity of the Scripture.

It is often remarked: "Criticism rests upon the very data of the Scripture." But it makes a difference what is done with these data, and how they are used. At a graduation

exercise during my student years in Utrecht, a learned opponent based a sharp attack upon the defendant upon the fact that in his essay he had written the same word now with a capital and again with a common letter. He truly brought out actual data. But the interpretation of them was altogether wrong. In the same way we need not assume too readily that the material of facts, *per se*, demands that interpretation which current higher criticism has put upon it. And here I may simply appeal to Professor Eerdmans, who, in the first part of his "Alttestamentliche Studien," draws the conclusion that the critical analysis which views Genesis as a compilation of documents from P, J, and E is not able to explain satisfactorily the literary peculiarities which mark the book.¹⁵ Again, it is a very superficial mode of procedure, on the ground of the use of different names of God, to infer that it is compiled from documents of different sources. It is well known that the newer critics unanimously attribute Gen. ii. 4b-iv. 26 to J. But do we find here the name Jahve used alone? Not at all. In chapter ii. we find Jahve-Elohim eleven times, in chapter iii. nine times the same composite, and Elohim four times besides; and in chapter iv. Jahve ten times, and Elohim once. Actually both names of God are here used. This surely is something to consider for the man who swears by the diversity of sources. In his treatment of the distinction between J on the one side and E and P on the other, Professor Wildeboer¹⁶ observes that "E uses many uncommon words and J distinguishes itself by many peculiar expressions. These and other peculiarities can be taken into account after the division has taken place on other grounds; but this provides no sufficient ground for the division itself. One has firm ground under foot only when in the history previous to the revelation of Moses the author uses Jahve or

*Elohim as names of God.*¹⁷ When, in the last instance, such a part, by reason of language, style, and content, cannot be attributed to the priestly Elohist, then it is original with the prophetic Elohist." In Gen. ii.-iv., therefore, one has not that firm ground under foot which Professor Wildeboer speaks of, however unanimously the critics attribute these chapters to J (with the exception of ii. 1-4a). Now it may be said: In Gen. ii.-iv. originally Jahve only was used (except where Elohim alone is found), but the redactor added Elohim in order to show that Jahve in chapters ii.-iv. meant the same as Elohim in chapter i.¹⁸ But this is purely conjectural, for which the traditional test offers not the slightest certainty.

In connection with the occurrence of the Divine appellation Elohim in this part, one can say: The writer, the Jahvist, does this purposely. But when you accept this, why, then, might not Gen. i., as well as chapters ii.-iv., be by the same author, who purposely used the word Elohim only in Gen. i. and after that Jahve-Elohim, etc.? If the Jahvist consciously distinguished between the use of the two Divine appellations, surely Moses also may have done the same.¹⁹

The question why Elohim is used in the narrative of the creation and Jahve-Elohim in the story of Paradise has a plausible answer. Elohim is the name of God as Creator and Governor of the world. It indicates God in that universal attitude in which he stands to all his works. Jahve is his name when there is reference to the covenant relation between himself and man, between himself and Israel. This name indicates God in that special relation into which he enters with some of his creatures. It is keenly felt, therefore, that in the conversation between Eve and the serpent the Elohim name is used, and not Jahve. In spite of the bold

utterance of Professor Wildeboer, not a few of those who have consented to the division of sources have always recognized that, apart from this division, in many cases the interchangeable use of the two Divine appellations can be satisfactorily explained. Professor Eerdmans candidly asserts: "He who divides Genesis on the basis of the Divine appellations is on the wrong track."²⁰

To most of the newer critics, the Old Testament, under critical treatment, has ceased to be the first part of Holy Scripture, and has become a book in which the remnants of Hebrew literature have been preserved for us. That is to say: Had the Old Testament continued to be the book of the Words of God for them, intrusted by the Lord to Israel, the study of the critics would have run another course. He who takes Kautzsch's "Abriss der Geschichte des alttest. Schrifttums" in hand, and in the introduction reads: "Even as with other peoples, so also in Israel, the most ancient period of literature was preceded by a time of songs and legends," perceives at once that here the Scripture has ceased to be Scripture, and that here Israel is no longer the people of special revelation. Kautzsch speaks about "Volksdichtung" and about the conditions to which the origin of this poetry is bound. But the revelation of God is not bound to our rules for the development of art. From his viewpoint Kautzsch may well complain that so little of the ancient folk-song has been preserved. But here an entirely different viewpoint from that of the literator is not only possible, but necessary. In sooth, all sorts of objections still remain against the whole theory of the beginnings of Israelitish literature. For the Song of Deborah and the fable of Jotham, which, according to the critics, belong to the oldest part of the Old Testa-

ment, exhibit a masterly use of form at which even Kautzsch is astonished.²¹

Professor Wildeboer uses interchangeably the expressions Books of the Old Covenant and Israel's literature.²² With him, also, literary interest weighs heaviest when, of criticism, he declares that it "leaves the Bible to witness for itself, and therefore dismisses all opinions of later compilers, copyists, and scholars who demand that we shall read the Scripture through their glass!"²³ But we reply, first, that it cannot be made out clearly by the critical method, neither is it determined, what is gloss or redactional work or added explanation. This is arrived at chiefly by the conviction with which one approaches the Scripture. The two problems: Whence comes the content of Scripture, is it the product of evolution or of revelation? and: How did the books of the Scripture in the literary sense originate? stand in closest relation to one another.²⁴ But, secondly, let us grant that criticism is able accurately to discriminate between original writings and later additions by compilers, copyists, and scholars, we may not forget that without the labor of these compilers, etc., the Bible had never been the Scripture. That which from the literary viewpoint may be divided may theologically be one.

Hence we are fully entitled to declare that the method which is applied to the Old Testament by the most commanding scholars²⁵ does no justice to this part of the Holy Scripture, because it approaches the Scripture with a preëstablished opinion which is antagonistic to what the Scripture itself declares concerning the books of the Old Covenant. The Scripture itself speaks of the "Words of God," and hence views the Old Testament also as the record of the revelation of God. I know well that many Old-

Testamentaci who wholly accept the method and the results of the newer criticism, yet speak of revelation, or, like Wildeboer, even of "a special revelation of God in Israel."²⁶ We may not question for a moment the integrity of such an utterance, but we should speak in this connection of one use of the word "revelation" which leads one into a wrong track. When, for instance, one turns to Lohr's small "Alttest. Religionsgeschichte," in which purely evolutionistically are treated successively a Beduin-religion, a Bauern-religion, and a Gemeinde-religion, one needs not be surprised to find there also a paragraph "über den Offenbarungscharakter der alttest. Religion." But it soon appears what Lohr understands thereby when he writes: "In the special cases in which it appears, this revelation is not to be taken as something magical or miraculous. Neither is the line of its development by any means a straight line. Nevertheless, the history of the Old Testament religion exhibits — permit me here to use for once an otherwise critical expression — a wonderful, spiritual development in the face of which we cannot repress the thought of a providential leading."²⁷

Ah, you exclaim perhaps with surprise, Is this the heart of the blunder [ist das des Pudels Kern]? But who, save a positive unbeliever, does not recognize God's providence which is over all his works! He who uses the word revelation in such a way that it means no more than what Kuenen would call "natural development"²⁸ is guilty of idea reduction [Entwertung der Begriffe]. And even though he himself may not be conscious of this Entwertung, he who has discerned it once cannot again pass it by.

While thus far, for the most part, I have spoken to you merely in a negative way, by showing that the newer criti-

cism should not be accounted as the unbiased over against the "traditional" or "dogmatic" view, since it also comes to the Scripture with a definite opinion of its own; and that this opinion is entirely different from what the church in all ages, and the Reformed Church in particular, on the ground of the Scripture itself, has confessed concerning the Scripture; I will now pass on to the more positive part of my lecture.

In all ages there has been a people of God who live by his Word. The patriarchs lived by his promises. The people of Israel has lived by the law and the prophets. The church of the New Covenant is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. Whenever error crept into the Christian church, the battle against it was waged in the right way only when appeal was made to the Word of the Lord. In the days of the Reformation the authority of the Roman hierarchy was shaken, not for the purpose of establishing the autonomy of the conscience, but the liberty of the conscience within the bounds of the Word of God. I am well aware that Articles II.-VII. of our Reformed Confession do not appeal strongly to us children of the twentieth century. But enter once into the churchly conditions of those days. Make it for once clear to your mind that, in spite of the sweetness of the mystics, the living truth was bound up in formulas and in externals. Then listen to the music that thrills in these Articles. Only when you see the Romish Church in the background, which accepted the Scripture theoretically as one of the sources of dogmatics alongside of tradition, the pope, councils, the church, church fathers, reason, etc.,²⁹ but which practically ignored the most positive utterances of the Scripture, and placed it beneath tradition and pope and church, can you understand the spiritual power

which speaks from that Confession. The Apocrypha are clearly distinguished from the canonical books as of lesser value; so that they can confirm no single article of faith, let alone attack the authority of the Holy Scripture. The canonical books are acknowledged as the only rule of faith, not so much because the church accepts them, as because the Holy Spirit bears witness to them. And the content of the Scripture is complete, as well in the sense of *sufficiens* as of *perfectus*. It needs nothing more either quantitatively or qualitatively. "Neither may we compare any writings of men, though ever so holy, with these divine Scriptures, nor ought we to compare custom, or the great multitude, or antiquity, or succession of times or persons, or councils, decrees, or statutes, with the truth of God, for the truth is above all; for all men are of themselves liars, and more vain than vanity itself" (art. vii.).

Of the divine character of the Scripture, the Confession declares: "that this Word of God was not sent, nor delivered, by the will of man, but that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (art. iii.).

This too is a viewpoint from which to study the Scripture: God's Spirit witnesses in us that the Scripture is the Word of the living God, spoken by men of God as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; so that nothing can be compared with it; so that it is the only and infallible rule of faith and practice. He who so stands before the Scripture sees the Scripture as a whole, as an organic whole, as a building constructed after a vast plan, as a structure dominated by one thought. He who so stands before the Scripture cannot separate the Old Testament from the New. The whole Old Covenant speaks of Christ, the incarnate Word, even as he himself witnessed of the Old Testament books: these are

they which testify of me; or, as the Apocalypse puts it, the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy (Rev. xix. 10).

Of course it might be said, This unity was imposed upon it. From scattered building materials — and criticism desires but to exhibit and view separately these several building materials, which have done service — a mighty spirit (or a school) has been able to create a harmonious whole. But in that case the unity of the Scripture would be a philosophical, ephemeral, and not a living one. Or if one says: This work of collecting and ordering and putting together can equally be a work where the Holy Spirit impels and directs, — the right view of Scripture, nevertheless, must always go out from the whole which has thus originated.³⁰

It needs no lengthy demonstration to show that this view-point regarding the Scripture can be construed in various ways. The testimony of such a man as Monier Williams, the learned scholar of Sanscrit and the Indian religions (1819–1899), who began by saying that Hinduism and Buddhism “were imposing efforts of the human spirit which works itself up to Christianity,” but ended with the acknowledgment that the holy books of the Indîers showed all “developments in the wrong direction”; such a witness may provide food for thought to those who say after Kuenen, in his “Godsd. van Israël”:³¹ “Faith in the election of the people of Israel includes that its religion has an entirely singular excellency, and so far excels all other religious forms as God’s work is more glorious than man’s. This, too, is a judgment which in earlier times would have gained a ready consent. The other religions were not known. . . . Now it is different.” After a most painstaking study in his essay on “De valsche profetie in Israël,” Dr. G. Ch. Aalders³² comes to the conclusion, “that with none of the ancient

culture-peoples can one find a formal analogy of Israelitish prophecy, not in Babylon, not among the Canaanites and Phœnicians, not in Egypt, not in classical Greece or Rome. . . . Taken as a whole, the Israelitish prophecy exhibits a sharply-defined character of its own which, even in its formal aspect, differs considerably from the mantic phenomena in the religious life of the peoples." James Orr³³ points to Israel's monotheism which is found even in the oldest documents; to the counsel of peace for the salvation of sinners, which finds absolutely no parallel in the only teaching — the doctrine of Zoroaster — which shows a faint agreement therewith; and also to the indissoluble tie which the Scripture establishes between religion and morality.

All these views, however, may confirm or shock us in our conviction regarding the Scripture: they cannot impart one. It is enough for the moment if it is plain that this viewpoint of faith is no absurdity which can be passed by with a mere shrug of the shoulder. But he who in Old Testament investigation goes out from entirely other, from more scriptural, than the philosophical or dogmatic principles of the newer critical school, must reach at many points entirely other results. This has been most soundly formulated by that clear thinker, who also went his own most radical way, Professor Kuenen. In his "Profeten en Profetie,"³⁴ he writes: "Of two things one, either we must put aside as worthless our dearly purchased scientific method, or forever cease to recognize any New Testament authority within the domain of Old Testament exegesis."³⁵ I would repeat this just as it stands, save that I protest against the claim put upon the epithet *scientific* in favor of the critical method. To deny the New Testament all authority with regard to the exegesis of the Old Testament amounts to an elimination of

the Christ from the Old Covenant; to a juggling away of what constitutes the leading thought in both Law and Prophets, and to a breaking up of the organic unity of the Old Testament. He who goes out from the Christ has an entirely different outlook upon the whole Old Testament than the *criticus*. Let me illustrate this by reading to you what Dr. Hoedemaker⁸⁶ writes on Gen. iii. 20: "And Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living," which verse is held by all adherents of the newer criticism⁸⁷ to be a gloss which does not fit in the connection. Wellhausen says of it: "After Gen. iii. 17-19 (the curse upon Adam) one would expect that saddened and crushed man should have waited for whatever God would do with him next, to wit ver. 21-24 (the expulsion from Paradise); instead of which Adam embraces the opportunity of giving his wife a name, for which there was not the slightest occasion, if it had not been the intention of the redactor of this part to prepare for Gen. iv. 1-15 (the birth of Cain and Abel, etc.)."

For my part, I do not find this an acceptable interpretation at all. For why, then, should not the redactor have placed that verse after verse 24? But listen to what Hoedemaker says in connection with Wellhausen's observation: "Here we see the *criticus* verily taking the part of the exegete. And we also see that he lacks all insight into the Protevangelium of verse 15 (I shall put enmity between . . .) as well as the right understanding of the faith through which Adam (see ver. 20) *accepts* this promise." It is so easy, and it sounds so scientific, to speak of dogmatic interpretation; but the heart of the matter is that again and again dogmatism clashes against dogmatism,⁸⁸ and he who has a good knowledge of the Reformed dogmatics, with its distinctions of general and

special revelation, of natural and revealed knowledge of God, of *theologia insita* and *acquisita*, which distinctions, however subtle they may appear at first sight, are not merely of a dialectic interest, but are evidently taken from life, — I say: he who knows well the Reformed dogmatics will not exchange them for the abstractions of philosophic thought, which, as in the case of the “*religionsgeschichtliche*” method, dominates all too largely the newer scientific investigation.

According to this method, which goes to work evolutionistically, the lowest must stand at the beginning. According to the constant view of the Scripture, the highest stands at the beginning, always in the sense of Reformed dogmatism which has never associated with Adam a *status perfectitudinis*, but only a *status integritatis*.⁸⁹ According to the writers of the history of religions, the history of Israel must show a continuous development from fetichism to monotheism; while, according to the Scripture, the history of Israel, by virtue of Divine revelation, moves on a higher plane, by which again and again the line of natural development is broken.

Thus far I have borrowed my illustrations from the so-called literary criticism. In case I have conveyed thereby the impression that from the viewpoint of the Reformed confession all similar criticism is from the evil one, permit me with a single word to dismiss it. Even as textual criticism, this criticism, too, has undoubtedly the right of existence. The Hebrew text of the Old Testament presents all sorts of difficulties. Comparison with old translations like the Septuagint, Peshito, and Itala frequently compels a choice between different readings. But with the comparison of several books (like those of Kings and Chronicles) we face equally questions of a literary-critical sort. Frequently the question presses itself upon the investigator: From which several doc-

uments has this book been compiled, or what documents have been used in the compilation? I but want to show that in the answer to these questions the dogmatic viewpoint of the investigator, as well as the so-called undogmatic, is of great weight. In fact, upon this it depends whether the knife of analysis is like the instrument of the anatomist, which cuts through nothing, but merely lays bare the component parts; or whether, in the graphic words of another, it is a Jehoiakim penknife, which cuts up the roll of the Word of the Lord into illegible strips.

There is, however, also an historical, sometimes called higher, criticism, which goes much farther than the literary, and whose course is marked by the names of Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, which not merely analyzes, but lifts the parts obtained by analysis out of their connection, moves them and combines them in such a way as to bring about the entire reconstruction of Israel's history, in which the law indeed obtains an entirely other place. The entire legal code goes by the name of Moses; but little, if any, of it owes its origin and record to this man of God. Deuteronomy then originated in the after days of the Judean kingdom, and is brought in by Josiah. And the so-called priestly code, to which, among others, belong all of Leviticus and large parts of Exodus and Numbers, dates from the Exile. This hypothesis by which, in general, the order of law and prophets has been reversed, has become just like the analysis of the Pentateuch into J, E, D, and P, one of the principal dogmas of the newer Old Testament criticism. He who dares doubt it is a great scientific heretic; nay, worse, a fool, not deserving of a hearing.

You know the attractive looking book of Professor Cornill, "*Einleitung in die Kanonischen Bücher des alten Testa-*

ments." When you read the paragraph therein devoted to the *Geschichte der Disziplin*, you get the impression that after Ranke, Hävernick, Hengstenberg, and Keil there really never has been put forth an effort by what men have been pleased to call the conservative side to interpret the Pentateuch as an organic whole, and to maintain the place of the law before the prophets. Nothing is less true than this. And though I would not assume the responsibility of everything that has been written, sometimes in apologetic fervor, and though the superiority of knowledge and learning was frequently on the side of the newer criticism, I will here say that many an able, well-digested, and well-documented work has been published which truly deserves the attention of the most enthusiastic *criticus*. Sometimes one gets the impression that the writings by men of other principles than the followers of the "religionsgeschichtliche" method⁴⁰ were passed in silence intentionally. But also where their names and works are mentioned, one seldom finds an effort to refute the difficulties proposed by them, and less still a fundamental exposition of the viewpoint from which the data are considered.

I cannot give a list of such books here, but a few names I will mention:—

John Thomas, "The Organic Unity of the Pentateuch," London, 1904. A work written in vigorous style, and after a logical method which is rare.

E. C. Bissell, "The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure," New York, 1885. In this work one finds an extensive account of the literature of the subject.

W. H. Green, "Moses and the Prophets," New York, 1883.

Idem, "The Unity of the Book of Genesis," New York, 1895. Here one is clearly shown that each part of Genesis

and the book as a whole is to be grasped as a unit, and as composition.

Ed. Rupprecht, "Das Rätsel des Fünfbuches Mose," Gütersloh, 1894. The writer is sometimes somewhat gruff, but says a good deal that is worthy of consideration.

James Orr, "The Problem of the Old Testament."

These are but a few names of men who express their objections to criticism from the viewpoint of the Christian faith. Thomas alone — who seeks and finds the force of his demonstration in the fact that he will not go out from a single supposition regarding Christ; who in turn also denies his opponents (he opposes Driver in particular) the right to present so-called scientific suppositions, — must perhaps be counted one with that not insignificant phalanx, which, although from no radically other viewpoint, enters its great objections to the critical results of the school of Wellhausen.⁴¹

While I am writing this a newly published book is placed upon my table (the title page is dated 1912). It is by Lic. Theol. Wilh. Möller,⁴² and bears the title "Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung." A hasty glance shows that it is a work of serious study. The writer has entered the field of Old Testament science as a Wellhauseian. But, as he expresses it, not on dogmatic but on historic grounds he has been compelled to look at the Scripture with other eyes.⁴³ Let me tell you something of the results which he obtained. "After more than ten years' continued course of study, I am ever more firmly convinced that it is more accurate to ask, What parts of the Pentateuch are not of Moses, than hesitatingly to attribute to him here and there some fragment." ⁴⁴ So he writes, and he shows, as it seems to me, irrefutably, that in either case Old Testament criticism cannot remain at the viewpoint on which it has prided itself thus far with so

much show of assurance and unassailability. It must either go on and break up into fragments what still forms units as J, E, or P, by which in the end the whole structure must collapse, or it must cease to divide the Pentateuch into different sources — on the ground of the interchange of the Divine appellations or of the so-called doublets — and thus return to the recognition of its inner unity.⁴⁵

I refer you also to Moody Stuart, "The Bible True to Itself," who has pointed out two serious difficulties in the way of the Kuenen and Wellhausen theory. From the viewpoint of that theory it remains inexplicable that in the priestly codex no mention occurs of song in the sanctuary,⁴⁶ and that Ezekiel's vision of the new temple has been left to the name of that prophet, and has not been incorporated in the priestly codex.⁴⁷ And last, but not least, I will mention with honor the name of Dr. Hoedemaker. When in the midst of my studies in 1894 his lectures on the Modern Criticism of the Scripture saw the light under the title "*De Mozaïsche oorsprong van de wetten in de boeken Exodus, Leviticus, en Numeri*," I took but little notice of them. For there was nothing to be said against the firmly established dogma of the transposition of the here indicated laws after the Exile. But when, by the arbitrariness in some utterances of the critics,⁴⁸ I came to doubt and to think, I soon began the closer study of the man — whose deep insight into ecclesiastical and political questions I had begun to appreciate — with relation to the Old Testament. Hoedemaker's writings are not easily read. His wealth of mind limits itself with difficulty to the sober lines of severe demonstration. And though he never loses the thread of his reasoning, it becomes at times so involved that it requires several attempts to find it again. But you are surprised again and again by captivating figures,

striking observations, and entirely new points of view, which open up before you. And above everything else you feel that this apologete does not seek what he might criticize here and there, but that he considers things from a viewpoint of his own, and that over against the dogmatism of modern criticism he posits the principles of the Reformed Confession. Hoedemaker clearly shows that the hypothesis of Reuss and Kuenen has not been obtained legitimately, but is founded on a purely naturalistic principle.⁴⁹ He clearly demonstrates how it is possible that such an hypothesis brought in from without can seem to fit the material offered by the Scripture. "An hypothesis or a preëstablished opinion with which one comes to certain data has the same effect as the introduction of some matter or other of chemical properties in a bottle that contains several liquids, to wit, that the allied matter unites itself with this, while that which cannot be united is precipitated. Everything which is in conflict with the hypothesis must present itself in this system as the result of deception or influence of tendency."⁵⁰

When in our country not only the eyes of the laity, but also of theologians, — who have been educated to be good orthodox critics, that is to say, educated in the faith of the infallible accuracy of the Reuss-Wellhausen hypothesis, — open to the fact that there is still another view possible; when among students generally the desire is in evidence to read the Bible not through the glasses of the sources-hypothesis [*Quellen-hypothese*], it is owing in no small measure to this eminent man to whose memory I bring my reverent homage.⁵¹

At the flattering invitation of "the Association for the Founding of New Professorships," I have consented to give a course of lectures on the subject, the substance of which I have tried to place before you in the introductory remarks,

which form the principal content of this lecture. I accepted this invitation not without hesitation, knowing what study is required in the domain of Old Testament Science to render one even measurably competent to express an opinion; and that in many respects I shall have to beat my own path. For although many valuable observations and hints are scattered abroad in the above-named and other works of anti-critics, more is needed than these. Almost all the Old Testament literature of the last century was more or less under the control of the generally admirable labors of the critical school. In one point there was agreement, but not in another. One stood polemically over against it, but allowed his opponents to mark out the path. Or one took the rôle of the apologete, to maintain old views. The works I have in mind contain indeed a great deal of building material, but it is scattered. And especially now, since after what seemed the invincible strength of the dividers of the sources serious breaches begin to show themselves in their walls, there is a crying need of positive upbuilding, lest the Old Testament problem shall presently assume proportions with which no one else shall be able to cope. Even if only in outline, you will see something of the structure of the Old Testament, and of its organic unity. You will see that it is not merely a theory when the organic unity of the Old Testament is spoken of; but that, from this principle, the Old Testament with all its peculiarities and difficulties and apparent contradictions is at least equally well, yes, better interpreted than from the aprioristic principle of the Religions-historian.

This at least is certain, that the view which causes the Scripture to be known as a composition, and not a compilation, shows itself to be the more accurate, yea, the only good one. For I can tear a composition apart and turn it

into a compilation of heterogeneous documents, when — if you will pardon this hackneyed and really unsavory figure — I handle the dissecting knife wrongly. But of a compilation I can never make a composition, no matter how hard I try. And that, in the words of Thomas, is the heart of the question, — not whether already existing documents have been used, but whether the final product was the work of one mind or a mish-mash of mutual antagonistic parts put together by a redactor.⁵²

There are in our days not a few theologians who own Christ not merely as the Saviour, but also call him the center of all sacred history, and who also accept the principal results of the criticism of Kuenen and Wellhausen. They accept not merely the division of the Pentateuch, but also the order of the documents in such a way that the priestly codex, which is the very heart of the Mosaic law, first originates in the Exile.

This very circumstance, that it seems practicable to see Christ as the center of Divine revelation and yet in Old Testament investigation to reach the same results as the modern practitioners of criticism, does not render it more easy to defend the organic unity of the Old Testament, that is to say of the Old Testament as it is, and not as criticism makes it. But this circumstance makes it the more necessary. I myself have felt, and feel ever more keenly, the untenability of such a viewpoint. For though I would not be behind any one in the feeling of reverence for those who in this domain have said: We investigate everything, but the most critical subject, that is the Christ, we leave alone; yet in the long run one faces here anyway an: either — or. For when one dismisses the results of criticism at the door of the last refuge of the faith, why then not dismiss them at the first?⁵³ When Christ re-

mains standing, why should not prophecy, why not miracle, why not inspiration? And, on the contrary: When you substitute redactional labor for inspiration, and put the wonder-narrative and the prophets-legend in the place of the wonderful fact; when you do not try to understand the prophets as organs of revelation, but as men who religiously and ethically were far in advance of their times, what then, in the last instance, is there left of Christ? He who will honestly adapt himself to the laws of critical investigation, must put every supposition aside. And then, even as Abraham and Moses, Jesus Christ must be put through the critical crucible, to emerge therefrom as nothing more than a critical result.⁶⁴

Because I feel the great importance and the glory of a work whereby Christ, in the end, is not the conclusion of our critical artifices, but the leading thought, the key of the difficulties, the meeting point of the divergent lines, the solution of the otherwise inexplicable, I find courage to begin these lectures. May the confidence imposed on me by the directors of this Association not be put to shame. Above all, may it be given me by God's grace to open the eyes of you, students, to the imperishable beauty of the building of the Scripture, which witnesses of the Incomparable, the most glorious of the children of men, the Only-Begotten of the Father. Of him sings the poetry of the Old Testament, of him, the seed of the woman, of him, the son of Abraham, of him, the lion of Judah's tribe, of him, the rod out of Jesse's stem, of him, the King-Priest, the anointed of God. To the eyes that search after him, and see him, the books of the Old Covenant become something else than a patchwork; even a mighty history of God's mercy, which bears the unmistakable tokens that it has come to us through human mediation, but

which, nevertheless, just such as it is, is one living whole, one organic unity.

NOTES.

¹ See *Die wissenschaftliche Lage und ihre Anforderungen an die Theologie* (Tübingen, 1900).

² *Ueber historische und dogmatische Methode in der Theologie* (Theol. Arb. aus d. Rh. wiss. Predigerverein, 1900, pp. 89 ff.).

³ *Godsd. van Israël*, vol. i. p. 224.

⁴ Here I quote what Professor Visscher writes in *Religion und soziales Leben*, vol. II, p. 24, though it is not directly relevant to my subject: "One must cease to impose change upon an hypothetical original condition, for, in that case, the only method by which it is brought about is of its kind aprioristic and not scientific. The true way can only be that in which the object of investigation discloses itself to the investigator."

⁵ *Troeltsch, op. cit.*, p. 93.

⁶ Page 255.

⁷ Compare with this Hunzinger, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Methode*, and Dr. H. H. Kuyper, *Evolutie en revelatie*.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁹ A full exposition of this is given by Dr. Kuyper in his *Encyclopædie*, vol. II, pt. I.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

¹¹ He wrote an *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Rotterdam, 1685). Strack (*Einleitung* (6th ed.), p. 5) says of him: "He searched after scientific truth, but frequently suffered lack of love of truth."

¹² This was the judgment not of an anti-critic, but of no less a personage than Ed. Reuss, the father of the newer criticism of the Old Testament (see Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* (1st ed.), vol. XIV, p. 399).

¹³ *Wilkeboer, Letterkunde des O. V.* (2d ed.), pp. 154, 416.

¹⁴ *De Mozaïsche oorsprong* (1894), pp. 115 ff.

¹⁵ See his *Die Komposition der Genesis* (1908), p. 83.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 160.

¹⁷ Italics mine.

¹⁸ So does, for instance, the Leyden translation of the O. T. See *Gen.* II, 4b.

¹⁹ Compare Rupprecht, *Das Rätsel des Fünfbuches Mose* (1894), pp. 36-38, etc., and Thomas, *The Organic Unity of the Pentateuch*, pp. 78-83.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 82.

¹¹ Abriss in de Beilagen van Die Hell. Schrift des A. T., pp. 137 f.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 1.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, vii.

¹⁴ Compare J. Orr, *Het O. T. en de nieuwere Critiek*, p. 2 f.

¹⁵ In this lecture I have been obliged to speak frequently of tone-giving scholars, dominant tendency, current views, etc. The extent to which anti-critics are ignored as unscientific may be seen from the sober observation of Strack: "The traditional apologetic tendency which derives the right to investigate critically the O. and N. Testaments has since the death of Ernst Wilhelm Hengstenberg (Professor in Berlin 1802-1869) no single defender at a German university." I question if in forty years a single man could be found in all Germany able to occupy an academic professor's chair, even if he did not sympathize with the Graf and Wellhausen hypothesis. From the quotation, however, it is evident that even so conservative a man as Strack is not capable to appreciate correctly the anti-critical viewpoint. For then he would have employed other words than traditional and apologetic, neither would he have characterized his opponents as men who simply deny the right of critical investigation. This they do not do, they only ask: From what viewpoint do you begin your critical investigation?

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, x.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 8 ff.

¹⁸ Compare Orr, *op. cit.*, p. 16, and Hoedemaker, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-46.

¹⁹ See Melchior Canus, *Loci Theologici* (1563), by Bavinek, Geref. Dogmatiek (1st ed.), vol. i. p. 2.

²⁰ Compare with this Dr. Kuyper on graphic inspiration (*Encyclopædie* (1st ed.), vol. ii. pp. 492 ff.), by which he understands: "that leading given by the Spirit of God to the spirit of the writers, compilers, and redactors, by which these *ἀγίαι γράφαι* assumed such a form as was predestinated in the counsel of peace, under the *media gratiæ*, by God for his Church."

²¹ Page 11.

²² De valsche profetie in Israël (1911), pp. 143-156. See p. 156.

²³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 28-33.

²⁴ Page 487.

²⁵ Compare with this thesis 7 at the end of Valeton's dissertation on Isalah: "Old Testament quotations in the New are of no authoritative value as proofs for or against one or another interpretation of Old Testament passages."

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 38 f.

²⁷ Gunkel, *Genesis übersetzt und erklärt* (3d ed.) (Handkommentar, Nowack), p. 23, says: It does not agree with the context. Compare Gerretsen, *De val des Menschen*, pp. 30 f.

* "Dogmatics prove an obstacle to the new criticism, because the new criticism antagonizes dogmatics," says Dr. Hoedemaker (*op. cit.*, p. 43) with reference to Professor Wilkens's treatment of "de Smonsage" in de Gids of 1888.

* Compare Gerritsen, *De val des Menschen*, pp. 12 f., 21 f.

* Strack's *Einleitung* makes a favorable exception, as (see, for instance, pp. 240 f.) it contains a list of the works written from the side of the anti-critics.

* Professor Klostermann, *Der Pentateuch* (1893, new ed. 1907), warns against too great confidence which most investigators place upon the results of critical analysis.

* The writer published already in 1899: *Historisch-kritische Bedenken gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese von einem früheren Anhänger*.

* Page 10. * *Op. cit.*, p. 211. * *Op. cit.*, pp. 11-46.

* See de Holl. vert. *De innerl. waarheid van den Bijbel*, pp. 33 ff.

* *Op. cit.*, p. 12.

* I am reminded here of the saying of Delitzsch that the Psalms have been altogether too much referred to later times.

* Pages 68 f. and 79 f.

* Pages 80 f.

* Let me here name the following works: Harold M. Wiener, *Studies in Biblical Law* (the writer himself is a jurist); J. S. Griffiths, *Problem of Deuteronomy*; and G. Vos, *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes* (1886).

* J. Thomas, *The Organic Unity of the Pentateuch*, pp. 3 f.

* "Is Wellhausen to count for everything when he strips Moses bare, and Schmiedel to count for nothing when he subjects Jesus to the same process of critical elimination? If we ignore the conclusions of criticism in the last refuge of faith, why not in the first?" (Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 18.)

* "The pure critical principle will not allow us to take our stand 'firmly and boldly on the appearance of Christ,' any more than upon that of Abraham. An honest adherence to the laws of criticism negates the presupposing of anything. Jesus Christ, no less than Abraham and Moses, must pass through its crucible, and issue forth as one of its conclusions" (Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 19). It seems to me that these lines of Thomas point out more accurately the weakness of the so-called "ethical" viewpoint with reference to the Scripture than the whole brochure of Rev. Mr. Hulsman.

ARTICLE II.

REASONABLE BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, D.D.,

TORONTO, CANADA.

IN the preface to his book,¹ Dr. Beecher expresses his belief that one of the great needs of to-day is that of "so setting forth the orthodox ideas that they shall appeal to the thinking of the present generation, and shall make the study of the Bible a live study" (p. v). His book is an attempt to meet this need, and he has aimed at giving a concise treatment at once comprehensive and concrete; "instead of presenting a logically complete outline, it presents a succession of topics that are typical in their character." The first six chapters, covering Part I., are concerned with the "Point of View and Principles of Reasonable Criticism." In the remainder of the book, consisting of sixteen chapters, instances are selected from different parts of the Old Testament to illustrate these facts and principles.

The opening chapter is entitled "Agnostic and Cryptoagnostic Criticism." By agnostic criticism is meant the attitude of those who will not affirm anything as to the existence of God, an attitude which of course prevents the holder from regarding the Scriptures as a Divine revelation. By "crypto-agnosticism" Dr. Beecher intends us to understand the position of those who are in a greater or less degree agnostic, but

¹ *Reasonable Biblical Criticism*. By Willis J. Beecher, D.D. 12mo. Pp. xvii, 335. Philadelphia: Sunday School Times Company. \$1.50, net.

who try to hold this position "without parting entirely from the traditional ideas of the sacredness of the Bible" (p. 4). This position, however, is really more dangerous than the former because it comes from "enemies concealed within the camp." Cryptoagnosticism is a denial of the truthfulness and trustworthiness of Scripture, and Dr. Beecher argues that "any criticism which unduly assumes or affirms the lack of truthfulness in the Scriptures is thereby marked as either agnostic or cryptoagnostic" (p. 6). Cryptoagnostic criticism is one of the great phenomena of present-day thought, and is being "pushed by a propaganda that is wonderfully effective." As an instance of this attitude a quotation is given from Cornill's "Prophets of Israel," in which it is said that the narrative of the Old Testament "gives a thoroughly one-sided, and in many respects incorrect, picture of the profane history, and on the other hand an absolutely false representation of the religious history of the people, and has thus made the discovery of the truth well nigh impossible" (p. 7). Wellhausen is also commonly reported to have compared his own teachings with those of certain Scottish scholars in the following terms: "I knew the Old Testament was a fraud, but I never dreamt, as these Scotch fellows do, of making God a party to the fraud" (p. 8). It is pointed out that these and other utterances are by no means exceptional, and also that many who are not so outspoken yet adopt lines of thought and practice which are not less subversive of the truthfulness of Scripture. One of the most serious elements of the situation is what Dr. Beecher calls "amateur cryptoagnostic criticism," this critical attitude being adopted by men who have not given any special study to the subject; and the greatest trouble is that many of these amateurs speak as though the issues at stake were not particularly important, but mere cases of

hair-splitting. Those, however, who have given most attention to the matter are aware that the situation is really serious, and that the questions are undoubtedly vital. If our confidence in the Bible as a source of information concerning religion is shaken, it is difficult to realize how far we may not go; for, as Dr. Beecher points out, "it is not by accident that agnosticism concerning the Scriptures is accompanied by agnosticism concerning the fundamentals in morals and religion" (p. 12). It will be seen from this first chapter that the book is thoroughly alive to the issues involved, and we are grateful to the writer for his plain and fearless statement of the case.

The next chapter discusses "The Great Present-Day Question: Are the Scriptures True?" This is, indeed, the vital problem to-day, not whether the Scriptures are inspired, so much as whether they are ordinarily true in their statements. This is the line to be drawn between the two schools of criticism, and all other distinctions are of minor importance (p. 15). In a series of carefully-stated paragraphs Dr. Beecher discusses this issue, and shows what is involved in a belief in the truthfulness of the Bible; and he concludes that we are compelled to recognize the fact that on this subject "we have antagonists as well as allies." It is essential to state in the actual words of the author the position as he conceives of it:—

"One is on the wrong side if he prefers interpretations that make Bible statements contradictory or incredible, rather than equally feasible interpretations that make them true.

"One is on the wrong side if he needlessly prefers interpretations that bring the statements of the Bible into conflict with facts known by means of evidence from other sources.

"One is on the wrong side if, finding an apparent discrepancy between a biblical statement and evidence taken from some other

source, he takes it for granted that the other source is to be preferred to the Bible.

"One is on the wrong side if he prefers mere guesses, or suggested inferences from theories, to the testimony found in the Scriptures.

"One is on the wrong side if he rejects the testimony of the Scriptures concerning the date and authorship of the various parts of the Scriptures, particularly in the cases where this testimony is abundant and clear" (p. 23).

"Finally, one is on the wrong side if he rejects in its general outline and main sweep the history of the religion of Jehovah as it is given in the Old and New Testaments" (p. 24).

If it be asked why it is necessary to insist in this way on the historical character of the Bible, the answer is obvious. We want to know the truth; and, since the Bible purports to give us the history of the religion of Jehovah, there is every reason to believe that it gives it correctly. As a matter of experience, those who deny the facts, usually tend to deny the religious ideas associated with them, "because the facts and the religious teachings are bound together, and cannot be permanently separated" (p. 26). This is a particularly fine chapter, and its truths should be pressed home by all who are concerned for the essential trustworthiness of the Old Testament. It narrows and clarifies the issue to concentrate attention on this point before concerning ourselves with any doctrine of inspiration.

But Dr. Beecher proceeds to discuss in Chapter III. "Inspiration. How God gave the Scriptures"; and it is interesting to observe his statement of the old position:—

"The essential, sane idea of the old tradition is that the Scriptures are a unique body of literature, provided by God as an especial revelation of himself to men, with the use of whatever superhuman means were needed for the purpose, and having the authority—that is to say, the value as evidence—which properly belongs to such an especial communication from God" (p. 28).

He has some timely words on the subject of "dictation,"

and allows that when we speak of God giving Scripture through men it is natural to picture the matter as God dictating thoughts or words to the human author. "I fancy we shall never be able utterly to eliminate this idea, though the theologies all repudiate it, and every thinker tries to divest himself of it" (p. 29). It is essential, however, to remember that inspiration is not dictation, and that the idea of a business man and his stenographer is absolutely untrue in connection with the most orthodox doctrine of inspiration. Of course those whose view of the Bible is "cryptoagnostic" misunderstand and often scoff at verbal inspiration, as though it were the same as mechanical dictation, and yet, as Dr. Beecher points out, this meaning is repudiated by the very churches and men who believe in verbal inspiration. All that the phrase means is, that inspiration has extended to words as well as ideas (p. 30). The conclusion may be heartily commended for its clearness and frankness:—

"All the formulated doctrines of inspiration teach that there are human elements in the Scriptures, as well as divine elements. They affirm that while the Scriptures were in a unique sense given by God, they were given through human authors, each having his own characteristics. They unanimously reject the idea of mechanical dictation. Whoever, in attacking old-fashioned views, neglects these facts, is guilty of foul play" (p. 31).

What, then, are we to understand by inspiration in relation to the Scriptures? The author's view is expressed as follows, and could not be more to the point:—

"By providential and spiritual influences the Supreme Power caused men to perform actions, and by like influences caused men to record the actions performed. Of course, the making of the record included not merely the taking down of memoranda, but all the subsequent literary processes. In their final form the records thus made are the Scriptures as we have them" (p. 33).

It is the uniqueness of Scripture when compared with all

other literatures that constitutes the strongest argument for some Divine supernatural element which can be described only by inspiration (p. 35 f.). This chapter forms a clear, sane, strong statement of the true view of inspiration, which ought to make it impossible to misconceive the conservative position; but we suppose that, in spite of all Dr. Beecher and others are saying, we shall still have the critical scoff at "dictation," as if this were the traditional doctrine.

When Dr. Beecher proceeds to his next chapter, "How to account for the Existing Situation," he has a good deal to say that old-fashioned conservatives will do well to heed; for he does not hesitate to charge the defenders of the older view with much of the blame for the successes of their adversaries. He thinks views formerly held concerning Scripture were at many points inadequate and incomplete, and at some points incorrect, and that there was a real need for modifying them. This should have been done before the adversaries had had the opportunity of attacking the Scriptures, and if only the older scholars had shown the proper qualities in revising current ideas much of the harm caused by modern criticism would have been prevented (p. 40). It was not that the older view was incorrect but inadequate; and, in the light of the progress of research, revolution in modern ways of thinking, increased attention to specialization, different conceptions of God's relation to the universe, and the ideas associated with natural law, Dr. Beecher thinks that conservative scholarship has been seriously to blame for the existing situation. Added to this, many people had come to hold the older opinions on the Bible in a very mechanical way, and this should have been realized and the position duly stated. If it be said that the new view has made the Bible a new book, the explanation is probably due to the fact that many

who say this have imbibed ultra-mechanical views, and the change that has come to them is a mental awakening as well as the acceptance of a new opinion. But "the higher appreciation of the Bible was not due to the new opinion, but to the mental awakening that accompanied it" (p. 49). And so Dr. Beecher concludes that we need a critical view which shall succeed where the so-called modern view has failed. The modern view attempts to discredit the older tradition without offering anything adequate as a substitute. It offers what would be a change for the worse, and not for the better. The imperative necessity is to have such a view as shall retain the truths of the older tradition, correcting and supplementing it when necessary, and presenting it from the changed standpoint of modern thinking, thereby making the Bible actual and vital for the present day. The perfect candor of this chapter will commend Dr. Beecher's view to many, and will enable them to see how thoroughly he justifies his opinion, expressed in the preface, that we need a view of the Bible that will appeal to the thinking of the present generation.

In Chapter V. we are introduced to the subject of "Views that are held concerning the Bible." The present position of modern criticism in relation to the Pentateuch, or Hexateuch, is first sketched with clearness and fairness, and it is quietly but forcibly pointed out at the end that anyone who regards the Scriptures as ordinarily truthful has of necessity to repudiate this position (p. 48). Moreover, the acceptance of this modern view of the Hexateuch will necessarily affect the view of the rest of the Old Testament, and even of the New; because the later books of the Old Testament presuppose the contents of the Hexateuch, and affirm that they were current from the time of Moses, while the New Testament obviously

bases itself upon the Old Testament as it is now. Nothing could be fairer than Dr. Beecher's statement of these serious and solemn issues; and once again he protests not against any modern view in itself, but against the agnostic or "crypto-agnostic" criticism which necessarily regards so much of the Bible as untrustworthy in its statements.

The First Part closes with Chapter VI., discussing "Accepted Principles of Criticism." Dr. Beecher rightly urges that, if the modern view is true, we ought to accept it, and that to be critical is thinking for one's self. No acceptance of authority can be substituted for the use of personal judgment; and the human mind must be free to examine evidence, and to yield to it when it is found to be sufficient and trustworthy. Dr. Beecher carries the war finely into the enemy's country when he says that one of the most prominent vices of current criticism is its hide-bound traditionalism, — its helpless dependence on authority as distinct from evidence (p. 14). It appeals to the authority of experts, and cites opinion instead of citing evidence. "The men of the new tradition regularly tell you that their view is that of eminent scholars, and therefore you ought not to have the face to think differently" (p. 75). But the question at once arises as to what constitutes an expert, for a man without religious sympathy is less equipped for Bible study than an unlearned person who possesses this qualification. Again, true criticism will avoid undue assumptions. We must exclude prejudices, and be willing to follow truth wherever it may lead. Here, again, current criticism is marked by the habit of false fundamental assumptions. It is assumed that the Scriptures are not actually inspired, that the text is not correct, that the testimony is not true, that the statements are not trustworthy, that miracle is unreal, and that Christianity is on no different footing

from other religions. Above all, it is assumed that Israel's religion came within the general theory of evolution, and is to be judged in the light of this hypothesis. Once again, the true critic will give attention to all the evidence that is within reach, and will take care not to overlook any point lest it should have a bearing on the whole. Dr. Beecher is easily able to show that much of our current criticism viciously neglects this law.

"It deliberately ignores parts of the evidence. It minimizes the bearings of the evidence in one direction, and exaggerates its bearings in the opposite direction. It refuses to let the different parts have their natural effect in limiting and interpreting each the other. On the basis of this refusal it needlessly resorts to text emendations and other methods of modifying the facts as given in the evidence" (pp. 80-81).

Other principles are mentioned which are equally deserving of attention; and we could hardly imagine a student or young clergyman studying this chapter without becoming convinced of the fairness and force of the principles here laid down. One thing is absolutely certain, and that is, that a careful attention to these principles would produce a generation of biblical critics of the right sort.

The remainder of the book is concerned with the application of the principles in a variety of ways, and Dr. Beecher has managed to touch upon most of the crucial questions of Old Testament Criticism. Part II., covering seven chapters, discusses "Reasonable Criticism as Affecting Particular Narratives." The first of these is "The First Narrative in Genesis"; and, as the outcome of a careful discussion, our author says quite plainly that those who are of the opinion that the writer of the Genesis narrative cannot possibly have known the facts that are to be found in his production are guilty of "illegitimate reasoning." "How can you tell what he knew,

except from what he says? If the thing was beyond his knowledge, how can you account for his saying it?" (p. 100). And he remarks that if some old-fashioned person accounts for this chapter by saying that God gave it to him by special revelation, no better account of the matter is possible, and that, in any case, "careful study vindicates the concrete truthfulness of the first narrative in Genesis" (p. 100). The next chapter, dealing with "The Flood Narrative," is one of the most forcible in the book, and four questions are asked: Is the narrative composite? Is it self-contradictory? Is it true? Is it historical? On each of these, Dr. Beecher writes with his accustomed plainness and convincing force. A chapter is given to "The Narrative Concerning Abraham"; and, as the result of a careful study of various aspects, the conclusion is drawn that Abraham is a real person, according to Genesis and the rest of the Old Testament, and that no one holds that the story was written as a piece of religious fiction for the sake of the lessons it teaches. "The denial of its historical character is a part of the general denial of the trustworthiness of the statements of the Bible" (p. 129). Other chapters in this part are "The Case of Jacob," "The Narrative Concerning Joseph," and "Shepherds in the Wilderness"; and on each of these Dr. Beecher says that which goes to the heart of modern critical discussions.

We can mention only in general the contents of Parts III. and IV. The former is occupied with "Archæological Discoveries," and the latter with "Certain Books of the Bible." Among the archæological problems are the Code of Hammurabi and the Elephantine Papyri, while the books discussed include Deuteronomy, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. It will thus be seen that Dr. Beecher has not overlooked any storm-centers of Old Testament Criticism.

From first to last he seems to us to have accomplished his purpose of providing a book that sets forth the orthodox ideas in a way that will appeal to the thought of the present generation. His book is as timely as it is valuable, and all lovers of the Bible are under a debt of gratitude to him for it. His candor, courage, forcefulness, and scholarship are everywhere in evidence. If men wish to know what a scholarly conservatism means they can find it here. Only the other day¹ Professor Stanley A. Cook, of Cambridge, said that the only sequel to the great mass of material now coming forth in regard to Palestine, and the only sequel to studies in anthropology, archæology, history, and the comparative study of religion is to warn us to "refrain from insisting upon the Old Testament as an accurate or trustworthy record of the development of Hebrew history and religion"; and, also, that we are to look upon the Bible "primarily as the outcome of varieties of ancient religious experience." This, according to Professor Cook, is "the object of progressive criticism." We could not have the issues more definitely stated, and Dr. Beecher's book presents an unanswerable argument for the precisely opposite view. He fully believes in the essential trustworthiness of the Old Testament narrative, and its accuracy as a record of the development of Hebrew history and religion. If it is not true, we have nothing to fall back upon but the theories of critical scholars, which are quite evidently based upon naturalistic premises, and are dominated by a view of the evolution of Israel's religion that logically does not allow of any superhuman intervention. It is impossible to confine the problems of the Old Testament to literary questions, for the fundamental issue is religious. It is the predominant and constant virtue of Dr. Beecher's treatment that he realizes this essential

¹ *Expositor*, March, 1912.

issue, and presses it upon his readers with quiet yet irresistible force. His discussions are a fresh and welcome indication that the day of the dominance of the Wellhausen view is coming to an end, and that, supported by a mass of historical and archæological material, the essential trustworthiness of the Old Testament as an historical and religious record will once more shine forth with all, and more than all, its ancient glory.

ARTICLE III.

THE SADDUCEAN CHRISTIANS OF DAMASCUS.¹

BY THE REVEREND G. MARGOLIOUTH, BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON.

IN an article which was commenced in the *Expositor* for December, 1911, and concluded in its number for March, 1912, I aimed at giving an answer to all the chief objections that have been raised by various writers against the interpretation of Dr. Schechter's Zadokite document which I offered in the *Athenæum* for November 26, 1910. Each of my principal critics had, however, written so exhaustively on the entire subject, and had, moreover, built up so elaborate a theory of his own on the meaning of the ancient text under consideration, that it was impossible to deal *seriatim* with all important details in an article that was designed as a defense of my own theory rather than as a special attack on any of the positions occupied by my learned opponents. When, therefore, the editor of BIBLIOTHECA SACRA offered me the opportunity of replying in a separate paper to Dr. W. H. Ward's article on the "Zadokite Document" in the number of this Quarterly for last July, I gladly determined to act on his suggestion as soon as time should permit.

I must, however, before taking up the various threads of the controversy, express my appreciation of the method followed by Dr. Ward in his effort to discover the true bearing

¹ This article was finished before the end of 1911, but was delayed for the purpose of enabling the writer to refer to the pages of Part II. of his article on the same subject in the *Expositor* which appeared in March, 1912.

of the document. He started without the least prejudice against the theory advocated by myself, nor had he at the outset (with the exception, I think, of a partiality for the Pharisaic hypothesis suggested to him by Professor Louis Ginzberg) any special propositions of his own to defend. He did his best throughout to look consistently at every side of the complex problem, and he registered everything that he considered to favor the Judæo-Christian theory with as much readiness as the indications which appeared to him to point in the opposite direction. Criticism of this kind is always pleasant to read or to listen to. One remains throughout on a foundation of fact, and the duty of trying to interpret the extant data without bias one way or the other is never lost sight of.

But how is it that so excellent a method may, nevertheless, lead to results that must be described as untenable? The answer is, that criticism is, in some respects, not unlike the working of a problem in arithmetic or algebra. For just as it is possible to follow a perfectly correct method, say in a problem of compound interest or of geometrical progression, and yet miss the right answer by making a mistake in some detail of the calculation, or by neglecting to take account of one factor or another, so may one pursue a critical inquiry in a thoroughly approved general manner, and yet fail to find the true solution of the problem by unconsciously omitting this point or that, by assigning an incorrect value to one fact or another, or by misinterpreting a sentence here and a sentence there.

But now to the special task before us. It will be best to group the details of our investigation under the following headings: 1. Did the document emanate from a section of the Zadokites? 2. The question of date; 3. Dr. Ward's sum-

ming up of the pros and cons of the argument; 4. His identification of the characters spoken of in the document.

1. *Did the document emanate from the Zadokites?* The Judæo-Christian hypothesis would remain unaffected by any answer that might be given to this question, for early Christian discipleship of one form or another could be professed and cherished by members of any of the parties into which the Jews were at that time divided. But, in studying the document, one cannot escape receiving certain impressions as to the original religious views of the people who produced it. Dr. Schechter had no hesitation in declaring that they were Zadokites; that is to say, that they derived their "spiritual pedigree" from the sons of Zadok whom the prophet Ezekiel (xliv. 15) represents as the faithful upholders of true divine worship at a time when Israel, as a body, had fallen away. Other scholars of note, furthermore, had as little hesitation in identifying these Zadokites with a section, at any rate, of the Sadducees known to us—though only in a summary and imperfect way—through the New Testament and Josephus. But Dr. Ward, attracted by certain arguments offered by Professor Louis Ginzberg, of New York City, is strongly inclined to think that the teaching of the sectaries from whom the document emanated "much more nearly approximates the teachings of the Pharisees than of the Sadducees." "No special emphasis" was, in his opinion, laid by the author of the manifesto on his Midrashic identification of his community with Ezekiel's sons of Zadok. It is true that the question of the presence or absence of emphasis in any given passage must be very largely a matter of literary feeling; so that an absolute demonstration one way or the other, resting solely on the wording of such a passage, could not be easily furnished. But it is confidently suggested that, even apart from

the support which the idea of emphasis derives from the considerations to be mentioned presently, many would agree that stress does rest on the sentence: "And the sons of Zadok are the chosen of Israel, [men] of renowned name, who rise up at the end of the days. Behold the setting out of their names according to their generations, and the end of their priestly station, and the number of their sufferings, and the years of their sojourning, and the setting out of their deeds" (p. 4, ll. 3-6).¹ The author would hardly have packed the sentence with so many important details of the calling, vicissitudes, and final destiny of the people whom he was addressing, if the center of gravity did not lie, for him, in the fact of their being the sons of Zadok, to whom so great a religious importance was attached by the prophet Ezekiel.

Equally difficult is it to accept Dr. Ward's opinion that the mention of Zadok is purely incidental on p. 5 of the document, where we are told that David, who had married several wives, "had not read the Book of the Law that was sealed, which was in the Ark. For it was not opened in Israel from the day of the death of Eleazar and Joshua and the Elders who worshipped Ashtaroth. And it was hidden and was not² discovered until Zadok³ arose." Here, again, the question of emphasis must largely depend on literary feeling; but most readers will probably agree that the author of the manifesto intended to make a special point in drawing so marked a con-

¹ Some of the details mentioned are not easy to explain. If "the end of their [priestly] station" signifies the last services they were allowed to render at the Temple in Jerusalem, they would appear to have undergone persecution on account of the attitude of their belief in John the Baptist and Jesus. This would also explain the clauses that follow.

² Adopting Dr. Schechter's emendation of the text. There is no word for "not" in the MS.

³ Who this Zadok was it is difficult to say. Possibly confused with the high-priest Hilkiah of 2 Kings xxii.

trast between the unsealing of the Law by Zadok and the ignorance of it on the part of David, whose dynasty was, according to p. 4, ll. 10-11, to be superseded "after the completion of the end in accordance with the number of these years."

One point of emphasis which Dr. Ward has entirely overlooked is the rather frequent play on the name Zadok that is exhibited in the document. In the very first line we have: "And now hearken all ye that know righteousness" (וְעַתָּה). Then again there is the important title "Teacher of Righteousness" that is given to one of the leading characters of the manifesto, and special stress also appears to rest on "the enactment of righteousness" in p. 20, l. 33 (very near the end of Part I. of the manifesto). For some further references bearing on this point, the reader may be asked to see the *Expositor* for March, 1912, pages 217, 232. But it may be here added that there are, in all, nine passages in which the root-meaning of the name Zadok was present to the mind of the author; and though it by no means follows that he was in each case actually thinking of his great religious hero, it seems natural to assume that, in some of his more important usages of the root צדק, and more particularly in the opening sentence of the manifesto,¹ emphasis does rest on the particular root on account of its connection with the name Zadok.

But the weightier part of the argument is yet to follow. Dr. Ward has clearly underestimated Dr. Schechter's position on this important point. On p. 433 he says: "The evidence that they opposed the Pharisees he [i.e. Dr. Schechter] finds in the passages which are supposed to refer to the 'fencing of the Law.'" His impression, therefore, was that Dr. Schechter's anti-Pharisaic view of the document was chiefly

¹ So also M. Israel Lévi in *Revue des Etudes Juives*, April, 1911. Vol. LXIX. No. 275. 4

based on the use of this particular phrase. But the fact is, that the supposed reference to the fencing of the Law was only used by him as a kind of auxiliary to this theory; and, in order to show of how little importance the phrase in question is to the theory, it is only necessary to point out that Dr. Kohler,¹ who rightly refuses to see in it an allusion to the "hedge" which the Rabbis purposely made around the Law, still strenuously upholds the view that the denunciations of the document are directed against the Pharisees, only dating it later than Dr. Schechter, and believing it to have emanated from Dosithean Samaritans instead of Dosithean Zadokites.

The real strength of Dr. Schechter's argument lies in the legalistic peculiarities of the manifesto, and more particularly in the Calendar, the Sabbath ordinances, and the Marriage Law. A Calendar which was in agreement with that of the Book of Jubilees,² and which, therefore, was not based on the observation of the moon, but had a solar year of twelve months of thirty days each, and four intercalary days in addition, could not possibly have been followed by the Pharisaic party in its early period.³ It is equally impossible that they could have had a marriage law which, on the question of divorce, appears to have been remarkably like that of the New Testament; nor could their Sabbath ordinances have been as strict as those presented in the document.

I am myself in agreement with Dr. Schechter on these

¹The American Journal of Theology, July, 1911, p. 407.

²See Schechter's Introduction, pp. xvi, xix.

³The present argument remains unaffected by Epstein's most acceptable suggestion (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, vol. xxii. pp. 10-13) that in Jubilees two kinds of years are used: a civil year of the kind mentioned in the text, and an ecclesiastical year of thirteen months of twenty-eight days each. For a fixed ecclesiastical year of this kind also excludes the need of calendric lunar observation.

special points. Only I hold that we have here to deal with a special section of the Zadokites (or, according to the more common view, which I share, Sadducees) who combined a certain kind of belief in John the Baptist and Jesus with their particular form of legalistic observances. As for the denunciations contained in the manifesto, Dr. Ward must, of course, believe them to have been directed against opponents of the Pharisees, presumably the Sadducees; but if the foregoing argument holds good, the body of people chiefly aimed at were either, as Dr. Schechter thinks, the Pharisees, or, if the Judæo-Christian hypothesis be accepted, the Apostle Paul and his followers, whom the sect regarded as the greatest enemies of the faith, on account of the anti-legalistic principles that were advocated by them.¹

2. *The question of date.* I have in the *Expositor* for December, 1911, endeavored to show that the 390 years after the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar (p. 1, ll. 5-8, of the manifesto) may, in accordance with one of the

¹ In the *Expositor* for March, 1912, p. 229, I have stated my view that the fierce denunciation against St. Paul and his followers was mixed with bitter feeling against the Pharisees, and probably also "with a certain amount of vituperation against the laxities of the main body of the Sadducees, who had remained aloof from the higher aspirations of our sectaries." This can, I believe, be satisfactorily illustrated by passages in the document. But one instance must suffice in this place. On the lower part of p. 4, two persons are specially attacked. One of them, the Belial who is "sent" (the same root as that from which the Hebrew equivalent of *ἀπόστολος* is formed), I take to be the Apostle Paul (see the *Expositor* for Jan. 1912, p. 229). The other, bearing the nickname *Tsaw* (i.e. "Command"), whose followers are styled "the builders of the hollow wall," may well represent the leader of the Pharisaic party of about A.D. 70, namely, Rabbi Yohannan b. Zakai, who, after the destruction of the Temple by Titus, transplanted the ruling body of Pharisaic Judaism to Yabneh. It is this party against whom the reproach of marriage with a second wife whilst the first is still alive is leveled.

faulty chronologies prevalent among the Jews in early times, be reasonably referred to near the time styled *Anno Domini*, and that the time indication found at the end of p. 5 of the document ("At the end of the destruction of the land," etc.) favors the final conquest of the Holy Land by Titus, rather than any other period within the three hundred years or so preceding that catastrophe. The inference would therefore be that the manifesto was composed within a limited number of years after the event of A.D. 70, and that the historical reference near the beginning of the exordium takes us to the starting-point of the Messianic movement)—which began with the preaching of John the Baptist.¹

As Dr. Ward's view of the two time indications referred to differs *toto coelo* from that given by me in the *Expositor*, I must be content to leave our respective interpretations of these data in undisturbed juxtaposition to each other. It would, in the entire absence of common ground between us, be manifestly useless to argue the special questions raised by these two portions of the text. All that I can do is to make an attempt at forming some common standing ground for possible *future* discussions on the date of the document; and I think that I may, with a view to this, point out that several of Dr. Ward's own conclusions on certain points bearing on this part of the problem by no means clash with my view of the points in dispute.

On p. 430 he, to begin with, shows that, as the Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which are referred to in the manifesto, are supposed to have been composed respectively not earlier than 125 B.C. and somewhat before 100 B.C., our document can be "hardly earlier than 80."

¹ On the discrepancy between St. Luke's account of John the Baptist and the data of the document, see the *Expositor* for March, 1912, p. 221.

This is a definite statement with which I can have no serious quarrel. But it is, at the same time, clear that the *terminus a quo* thus postulated would leave the *terminus ad quem* an open question; and, supposing that the balance of evidence should, on further consideration, appear to Dr. Ward to incline decidedly towards the Judæo-Christian hypothesis, he might possibly be disposed to regard with some favor my interpretation of the two special time indications set out in the *Expositor*.

Another important matter bearing on the date is the evident need of some outside historical support for the settlement of our sectaries at Damascus; and on this point Dr. Ward himself states (pp. 440-441) that "whilst we have no definite knowledge of any Jewish settlement in Damascus" during the first century B.C., the account given in the Acts of the Apostles of the beginning of St. Paul's apostolate "implies that Damascus was a chief seat" of early Christian believers.¹ We have, therefore, to choose, as a date for the migration of our sectaries to Damascus, either a period in the first century B.C., in which no migration such as is mentioned in the document is historically attested, or a time in the first century A.D. during which settlements of a similar kind can be clearly shown to have taken place. But is it not sounder to base the interpretation of the document on definite and independent historical evidence rather than upon an assumption for which no outside support can be found?

On the interesting question as to Jewish belief at the beginning of the Christian era with regard to Davidic or Aaronic descent of the Messiah, I have set down certain remarks in the *Expositor* for March, 1912, pages 219-220.² But, as Dr. Ward's theory is partly based on a reading of the facts

¹ See the note on p. 514 in the *Expositor* for December, 1911.

² See, also, the *Jewish Review* for November, 1911, pp. 367-368.

relative thereto which differs from mine, it is necessary to refer to the topic in this place. "Another evidence," he writes, "that the Document was written before the overthrow of the Maccabean dynasty of priest-kings, is the fact that when it was composed the Messiah was expected still to come from the tribe of Levi, as John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannæus. The overthrow of that dynasty discredited such an anticipation, and before the dawn of the next century a Davidic Messiah was expected" (p. 451).

Now if this categorical statement corresponded exactly to historical fact, Dr. Ward's theory would, indeed, have a foundation to rest upon. But is it true that the fall of the Hasmonean dynasty brought about a universal return to the idea of a Davidic Messiah? Did the Temple hierarchy cease to exist with the overthrow of Maccabean rule, and would not the powerful body of Temple ministrants still be likely to cling to the expectation of an Aaronic Messiah, though not necessarily of Hasmonean descent? Did not, as a matter of fact, Herod himself seek to strengthen his position as Jewish king by alliances with the family of the Hasmoneans and that of Boëthus? But still more definite, Do not the Gospels themselves show that there was a strong disposition to acclaim John the Baptist as the Messiah (St. Luke iii. 15; St. John i. 19-20), although he was, according to St. Luke's account, of priestly descent both on his father's and his mother's side?¹ Dr. Ward has clearly drawn for himself too rigid a dividing line between the expectations of a Davidic and an Aaronic Messiah. There no doubt was a cleavage among the Jews on this part of Messianic belief at the beginning of the Christian era, and no wonder that a Judæo-Christian sect springing

¹ See, further, the *Expositor*, March, 1912, p. 219.

from the Sadducean party should have taken pains to emphasize the Aaronic side of the great belief.

One other important point before closing this part of the article. From an interesting passage on p. 6 of the document, where it is ordered that "all who were brought into the covenant are not to enter into the sanctuary to kindle its altar, but were rather to close its doors . . . if they will not observe to do according to the interpretation of the Law," etc., Dr. Ward infers (pp. 448-449) that the sectaries, dissatisfied with the existing state of things in the Holy City, left Jerusalem while the Temple was still standing, for the purpose of carrying a purer worship to Damascus. If this were so, the opinion that the migration to Damascus took place after the catastrophe of A.D. 70 would, of course, fall to the ground. But Dr. Ward's inference is entirely unwarranted. What the passage in question does insist on is the true inwardness of Divine worship. It is not enough, the manifesto declares, to have formally entered the Covenant, but those who have joined the new brotherhood at Damascus must be careful to obey the holy Law "to the ending of wickedness, and they must separate themselves from the children of destruction, and keep aloof from the wealth of wickedness," etc. Otherwise they will not be allowed to have any part or parcel in the worship of the sanctuary. It is reality on which the document in its own way lays special stress, and one may add that such insistence on reality¹ may fairly be regarded as additional evidence of the affinities of our sectaries with the early circles of Christian believers.

¹The same insistence of reality, though in a different form, is also found on p. 20 of the document. The closing of the door of the sanctuary in the passage on p. 6 is rather a disturbing element in any case; but it was, no doubt, suggested by Malachi i. 10, that verse being actually quoted in the passage.

3. We may now fitly consider *Dr. Ward's summing up of the arguments for and against the Judæo-Christian hypothesis* set out by him towards the end of his article (pp. 451-454). With the reasons adduced by him in favor of my theory I can, of course, have no quarrel. It is only the objections with which I am here concerned. Let us take these *seriatim*.

(1) On p. 451 Dr. Ward gives, as one of his grounds for rejecting my dating of the document, the absence of any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. But it will be seen, from what has been said in the preceding section of this article, that the time indication for the migration of the sect to Damascus ("At the end of the destruction of the land," etc.) is, in reality, the reference which he desiderates. As I have shown in the *Expositor* for December, 1911 (pp. 507 ff.), the only two previous occasions which could possibly enter into competition with the catastrophe of A.D. 70 for the explanation of our text, namely, the disasters under Antiochus Epiphanes and the invasion of Palestine by Pompey, represent only an approach to the devastation suggested in the document. The omission of any special mention of Jerusalem and its Temple is no difficulty, as the sectaries, who were ready to build a sanctuary in Damascus, would hardly be desirous of referring to the Temple of the now abandoned city. Furthermore, in dealing specially with Dr. Ward's own theory in relation to this point I have (p. 509) pointed out that, if the document had been composed about 80 B.C., it would be quite impossible to give a satisfactory explanation of the sentence: "At the end of the destruction of the land."

(2) On p. 454 Dr. Ward makes a special point of the fact that there is no reference to the Lord's Day in the manifesto. To this objection a double answer can be given. It is, to begin with, pretty certain that the institution of the Lord's Day

was in early times confined to Gentile adherents of the faith living outside Palestine.¹ And there is, secondly, the important consideration that, even if the generality of Jewish Christians living in or near Palestine had in those early days already regarded the first day of the week in the light of another Sabbath, it would not at all follow that our sectaries would in any way be inclined to adopt the innovation. My claim is not that they were followers of the Twelve Apostles or that they were ready to give obedience to James of Jerusalem, but only that they, in a certain loose sense of their own, religiously venerated John the Baptist and Jesus, and that they can, therefore, be classed as belonging "to the outermost fringe of the society of early believers."²

(3) Dr. Ward's statement that the sectaries had a monthly collection for the poor, instead of a weekly one, rests on a doubtful passage;³ and it must be added that an administrative detail like this could not in any case be used as an argument against the Judæo-Christian hypothesis, the less so as the rule of weekly offerings is, for the earliest period, so far only known from a Pauline source (see 1 Cor. xvi. 2), and may, therefore, have formed part of a system introduced by the very man whom our sectaries would be least likely to imitate.

(4) Dr. Ward further argues that "their officers [the searcher and judges] are not of the early church." But an answer to this objection has been anticipated by the proposed rendering of מִבְּקֵר (translated "Searcher" by Dr. Ward) by ἐπισκοπος.⁴

¹ See, e.g., Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iii. p. 140, col. 2.

² See the Expositor for December, 1911, p. 517.

³ See Schechter's note on p. 14, l. 13, of the document.

⁴ See the Expositor for March, 1912, p. 226, note 1.

(5) The argument from the retention of the oath by the sectaries must also be regarded as inconclusive, as all the extant indications of church rule with regard to this matter point to the fact, that whilst the command not to swear at all was regarded as the great ideal to be aimed at, the administration of oaths in legal procedure remained all along a practical necessity, more particularly so as only the less firm Christians would be likely to appear before a court as litigants.

(6) There remains Dr. Ward's statement that "there is no reference to the manner of the tragical death of either John Baptist or Jesus." But an answer to this difficulty has, as in the case of (4), already been given in the *Expositor* for March, 1912 (p. 223), where it is suggested that a graphic reference to the trial of Jesus should be recognized in the sentences at the end of p. 1 of the document; for we there read that "they justified the wicked one¹ and condemned the righteous one . . . and they trooped themselves together against the life of the righteous one . . . and they goaded the people to hostility." There is, it is true, no mention of the tragic death of the Baptist; but why should such a reference be expected in a document which does not profess to give an ordered history of events, but is merely a manifesto, a call to arms, as it were, addressed to the sectaries by their leaders at a certain crisis in their history?

4. I have in the preceding sections of this article dwelt mainly on the differences between Dr. Ward and myself with regard to the general tendency and the probable date of the document. But questions of a closer and more definite kind still remain. It is only fair to test Dr. Ward's theory by his

¹ By the wicked one who was justified by the ruling party, Barabbas is probably meant.

identification of the historical characters referred to in the text before us. There is, first of all, "the root of planting from Aaron and Israel," also called the Anointed one, the effect of whose ministry was such that people "contemplated their sin and knew that they were guilty men"; then there was the "Teacher of Righteousness," who came twenty years later; and, lastly, there is the rather frequent reference to "the man of scoffing," who is also styled Belial and "man of lies." Who were these three persons, according to Dr. Ward's theory?

The answer must, unfortunately, be that instead of order we find here nothing but chaos. He, first of all, seems to ignore the significance of "the root of planting," that came from Aaron and Israel, or he perhaps tacitly identifies the same with the Teacher of Righteousness, who came twenty years later. Yet he treats the "Anointed One from Aaron and Israel" who is mentioned several times later¹ as being different from the "Teacher" (though he does not do so consistently). In one place the mention of the Anointed One implies, according to him, no historical reference. In four other places he is spoken of as "yet to appear." He takes the "Holy Anointed one" mentioned at the beginning of p. 6 of the document to be the same as the Anointed from Aaron and Israel, and yet says of him that "it must be some priest like Ezra or Mattathiah of Modin, father of the Maccabee brothers" (p. 442).

Equally uncertain and elusive is his attempted identification of the Teacher of Righteousness. On p. 444 he says that the "most likely candidate is Mattathiah," whose possible identity with the "Holy Anointed One" he has, as has been men-

¹On "the Anointed One from Aaron and Israel" and "the Teacher of Righteousness," see the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April, 1911.

tioned, suggested before. The "Only Teacher" spoken of on p. 20 of the document he declares to have lived, and perhaps also died, at Damascus. In another passage (p. 6, ll. 10-11) the Teacher appears to him to be identified with the Anointed one, because "the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness in the latter days" is there spoken of.

In a no less puzzling condition does Dr. Ward leave the question as to the identity of the "man of scoffing." He considers the bearer of this title to indicate Jeroboam; but he does not explain how the sin of idolatry, represented by the setting up of the golden calves at Dan and at Bethel, applies to the Israel of the first century B.C. As a matter of fact, the worship of idols is not one of the transgressions denounced in the manifesto. Nor is the identification consistently carried through. The "men of scoffing" mentioned on p. 20 are, on this hypothesis, not the followers of the "man of scoffing," but a class of men "who lived at the writer's time." The "man of lies," moreover, whom one would naturally identify with the "man of scoffing," is, again, not Jeroboam, but belongs to a period just before the writer's time. That there is chaos, instead of order, in all this, no one can doubt, and Dr. Ward would probably acknowledge that the difficulties of the subject as they presented themselves to him could result in nothing else. He has done his best to discover a clue to the problem; but can it be said that he has found one?

The result, therefore, of our investigation would seem to be:—

1. The document is Zadokite.
2. The most likely date of its composition lies between
A.D. 70 and 80.
3. Dr. Ward's summing up of the arguments for and

against the Judæo-Christian hypothesis requires to be very considerably modified.

4. The identifications proposed in the *Athenæum* for November 26, 1911, represent a more coherent and orderly reading of the document than those suggested by Dr. Ward.

ARTICLE IV.

THE MINISTRY OF PAIN.

BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., WUCHANG, CHINA.

II.

A PREVIOUS article indicated the great importance of the susceptibility to pain in connection with the development and nurture of the body, and the value of pain in the diagnosis and treatment of disease and injury. To guard against exaggeration it also pointed out that pain is not always so dreadful as it seems, as proved by the actual experiences of the sick and wounded, even death itself, in the great majority of cases, being accompanied by little or no physical pain.

2. *Pain and the Development of Mind.* In his mental attributes man is unique. The difference between him and the lower animals is not simply one of degree but of kind, corresponding to the fundamental difference between instinct and intelligence.¹ "What a piece of work is man! How infinite in faculties! in apprehension how like a god!" Yet the lower animals though they do not possess our intensity of consciousness, and from the absence of language can have no trains of feelings, have a consciousness which more or less foreshadows our own. In the study of actions associated with this consciousness, as also in the study of the human mind, it is found that pain has been a most important factor in mental development.

In the evolution of the nervous system much has been gained when all the impulses and activities of the organism are

¹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution* (1911).

brought under the control of one center or brain, which determines and directs the responses of the body, immediately and harmoniously, to environmental changes. Such reactions in the lowest forms of life are termed "fatal," not because they bring certain death, but because the response is inevitable and indiscriminating, being fixed by the structure of the nervous system. In the dark, a moth is drawn irresistibly to small white objects. If the object is a flower, the impulse is advantageous to the moth. It is otherwise if the object is the flame of a candle, yet the impulse to fly towards it is equally irresistible. The first time the moth flies near or through the flame it may be scorched only; but, as it has no faculty to enable it to profit by its painful experience, the impulsive reaction is repeated until the moth is destroyed. Therefore, the next step in the ascent of the scale of life must be the modification of the nervous system so as to render possible the education of the individual by past experience. Consequently, a certain part of the developing brain comes to act as an organ of memory. In this new nerve center, traversed by all the impulses coming from the lower centers, the response to the attractive impulse of the flame, after the first painful experience, is succeeded immediately by a strong inhibitory impulse which prevents any repetition of the act. Painful impressions must be always predominant, because the very existence of the animal may depend on the reaction caused by them taking the precedence of and inhibiting others. Such reactions quickly become reflex or instinctive. This educable part of the nervous system in which the direction of impulses depends on past experience and habit, is represented in man by the cerebral hemispheres. The possibility of all education rests on the power which the nervous system possesses of organizing conscious actions into more or less unconscious or reflex op-

erations. A burnt child dreads the fire, and instinctively shrinks from its contact. It follows that "pain is the great educator of the individual, and is responsible for the laying down of the nervous paths which will determine his whole future conduct, and the control of his lower by his higher centers." ¹

But the registration of experience, primarily of a painful kind, would not have availed man so powerfully in his ceaseless struggle for existence, if he had not been able to communicate that experience to those who combined with him for mutual protection and service. The great advantage of the gregarious state lies not so much in the increased physical strength of the many over the one, as in the mental strength of the combination. And to evoke this mental strength and coöperation in the presence of danger, there must be means of communication between the different members of the group. Hence the signs, gestures, and intonations exhibited by the higher animals, and the acquisition of speech by primitive man. The necessity of being constantly on the alert to avoid pain and death has, therefore, been a powerful stimulus to the acquisition of a faculty which has been described as the main factor in the mental evolution of man. For as soon as individual experience can be symbolized in speech and writing, it becomes a part of the common heritage; and so can be utilized for the education of others, and for the general welfare of the whole community.

The growing ability to profit by painful experience gave primitive man the intelligence and cunning which was of more importance to him in the struggle for existence than sheer physical strength. He had to contend with the forces of

¹ Starling, address to Physiological Section, British Association for the Advancement of Science, 1909.

nature, with wild beasts, with the foes of his own species. He was constantly in labor and travail; in cold, hunger, and nakedness; in peril of wounds, disease, and violent death. These various emergencies developed new capabilities. As the struggle became keener and more general, intelligence became, more than ever before, the condition of life or death; and man's wits developed correspondingly. "Fitness, in the stormy days of the world's animal youth, meant fighting fitness." One of the main factors in the higher brain development of man was the conversion of the upper limbs into true hands, for the purpose of attack and defense. From the first moment that the advantage was recognized of using a club or a stone in attacking his prey or defending himself from his enemies, the direct incentives to a higher brain development came into existence, for the hands began to educate the brain. In the course of time, still urged onward by the necessities of war and the chase, other weapons and tools were invented, and the foundations of the various arts were laid. "If we could rid ourselves of all pride, if, to define our species, we kept strictly to what the historic and prehistoric periods show us to be the constant characteristic of man and intelligence, we should say, perhaps, not *Homo sapiens* but *Homo faber*."¹

When men became welded into tribes and nations, war, with all its pain and sorrow, continued to shape human thought and history.

"The strongest nation has always been conquering the weaker; sometimes even subduing it, but always prevailing over it. Every intellectual gain, so to speak, that a nation possessed was in the earliest times made use of—was invested and taken out in war; all else perished. Each nation tried constantly to be the stronger, and so made or copied the best weapons; by conscious or unconscious imitation each nation formed a type of character suitable

¹ Bergson, *Creative Evolution*.

to war and conquest. Conquest improved mankind by the intermixture of strengths; the armed truce, which was then called peace, improved them by the competition of training and the consequent creation of new power."¹

The pains of injury and disease also contributed to man's mental growth; because, in the search for relief and health, he was eventually driven to ascertain the physical cause of the pain, and then to connect it with the effect. Such investigations increased the precision of the perception of causation in nature generally, and revealed the close relation of man to nature, so that he came to see that all things were subject to the same physical laws. In this search he has won great triumphs over disease and pain, the discovery of anæsthetics, and of the connection of micro-organisms with disease, being only two of the successes in the struggle for man's physical redemption of man.

In addition to being smitten by war and scourged by disease, man has had to contend with fire, earthquake, storm, flood, and other calamities of nature. The efforts to protect himself against them has added largely to the sum of human knowledge and accelerated human progress. Where nature is so kind that people can live with little effort and in perfect security, they may have the happy carelessness of children, but in intellect also they are as children. Nothing great has ever come from the lands of the lotus-eaters. But Nature, with beneficent sternness, allows few of her children to remain in this state. The naked nomads of sunny Paleolithic times appear to have inhabited the wooded banks of rivers, living on fruits and the small fauna, till the advent of the piercing cold of the Glacial period forced them to take shelter in caves, and to protect their bodies from the cold by the skins of ani-

¹ Bagehot, *Physics and Politics*.

imals. It is difficult to realize how much the severe climate which then supervened contributed to the development of their physical and mental attributes. It roused their dormant energies to the pitch of being able to adapt their mode of life to the changing conditions of their environment. When the Paleolithic people finally emerged from their contest with the forces of nature, they were physically and mentally better than ever equipped for the exigencies of life. A greater power of physical endurance, improved reasoning faculties, an assortment of tools adapted for all kinds of mechanical work, and some experience of the advantage of housing and clothing, may be mentioned among the trophies which they carried away from that long and uphill struggle.¹

Lastly, intellectual progress is itself accompanied by its own peculiar pains. New ideas rouse men from comfortable mental torpor; what is unwelcome must be considered, and cherished notions, perhaps, must be abandoned. Within and without there is incessant and sharp conflict between the old and the new. Out of the turmoil and struggle, new truths emerge, old truths are seen in clearer light, error and ignorance are dispelled. As a very large proportion of the disorders and tragedies of life is due to the want of clear thought and intelligent foresight, it will not be until all men have learned wisdom,—earthly and heavenly wisdom,—that we can expect such disorders and tragedies to occur no more.

Considering the subject as a whole it must be admitted that physical and mental distress has been an indispensable aid to the development of the human mind and the progress of all knowledge.

¹ Art. "Anthropology," *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1910).

"Behold the life of ease, it drifts,
The sharpened life commands its course;
She winnows, winnows roughly, sifts,
To dip her chosen in its source.
Contention is the vital force,
Whence pluck they brain, — her prize of gifts."

3. *Pain and Moral Development.* The problem of practical ethics is the formation of character in the presence of all the evil in the world; and without pain and sorrow coming into the individual life, it is hard to see how moral character can be formed. For his successful progress as far as the savage state, man has been largely indebted, in the words of Huxley, to those qualities which he shared with the ape and tiger: his exceptional physical organization, his cunning, his sociality, his curiosity, his imitativeness, his ruthless and ferocious destructiveness when his anger was roused by opposition. Standing by himself, he had to be self-assertive, to obtain a foothold in the world; for the most alert and strongest seized and held with unscrupulous energy all they could grasp, leaving the weak to perish. Pain and injury, besides the actual suffering, meant more or less disability for the pitiless struggle, and so had to be avoided. Intellectually, primitive man had the mind of a child; morally, he identified right with pleasure, and wrong with pain and deprivation.

He was non-moral rather than immoral, and the path to moral freedom and greatness stretched before him through the realm of toil and pain. Further, the more he advanced, the richer his intellectual and moral nature, the more vulnerable he became to pain. In thinking beings it is anticipated with fear, brooded over when present, and often resented. If the physical senses alone were affected by pain, it would possess only momentary power. It is in the broader sense of the word that pain is now to be understood.

In the earlier and purely animal stages of existence, it was right for each individual to pursue pleasure and avoid pain, for this selfishness did not endanger the welfare of the species, but rather favored it. In its origin, avoidance of pain was the surest safeguard for the perpetuation of life, and, with due qualifications, this is still the case. But as soon as sociality became established, and Nature's supreme end became the maintenance of the family or clan organization, rather than the life of the solitary individual, the standard of conduct became different. Limits were interposed, at which pleasure must be resigned and pain endured, even certain death encountered, for the sake of the organization to which the individual belonged.¹ Devotion to his family and the desire to perpetuate his kind, meant that he had to fight desperately and unceasingly. The children who had no fathers to fight for them perished, and so that particular family or line became extinct. So with larger associations. The clan or the nation composed of men able and willing to combine and fight on its behalf conquered those who lacked this cohesion and strength, either because they were weak, or were too wild and reckless to be brought under discipline. "Order is Heaven's first law," and those who first learned to govern their wayward impulses and obey a chief gained a great advantage over their rivals, as the slightest bond was then sufficient to turn the scale.

In spite of its dark and cruel side, military warfare seems to be necessary, certainly in the rough and early stages of civilization, to implant in man the habits of trained obedience, the dignity of duty, valor, veracity, chivalry, self-sacrifice, and other masculine virtues, and to weed out weak and corrupt communities. To the Romans, the most powerful military nation of ancient times, the word "virtue" meant courageous

¹ Fiske, *Through Nature to God*.

manhood; and the Roman soldiers, at their best, reached a high moral standard. In them, courage

"was not merely animal daring. It was duty, obedience to will, self-surrender to the public good. The Roman legions subdued the world; but it was not their discipline alone, nor their strength, nor their brute daring. It was rather, far, their moral force—a nation whose legendary and historic heroes could thrust their hand into the flame and see it consumed without a nerve shrinking; or come from captivity on parole, advise their countrymen against peace, and then go back to torture and certain death; who could devote themselves by solemn self-sacrifice (like the Decii), bid sublime defiance to pain, and count dishonor the only evil. The world must bow before such men; for unconsciously, here was a form of the spirit of the Cross,—self-surrender, unconquerable fidelity to duty, sacrifice for others."¹

From their life, St. Paul drew many metaphors to illustrate the spiritual conflict which all have to wage against the evil in their own hearts and in the world outside, and in the early days of the church, Christians were fond of calling themselves soldiers of God. The moral code, or *Bushido*, of the brave Japanese, is essentially military, its five principal virtues being loyalty, propriety, courage, fidelity, and simplicity. Perhaps it is in Christian lands that we have the finest exhibition of the soldierly spirit. "Who does not admire," says a recent writer, "the quite unmistakable note that you get in a very few people who, in one way or other, have actually accepted death, and are only, so to speak, alive in the meantime. It belongs to the flawless perfection of the military spirit, with its entire detachment from life itself, from self-will, from fear, from ease, and from all pretences."

Not only in the military profession, in every occupation and rank, thousands have been conspicuous for moral bravery and self-sacrifice, men who reach the high mark of their calling by not counting their lives dear when the welfare of others is at

¹Robertson's Sermons.

stake. In countless cases, the risk of loss, pain, and death has been incurred without the hopes which strengthen and cheer the martyrs of the great religions. Pain has already wrought a noble work when men apply to themselves and to each other the words of the old Greek poet:—

“O mine own friend! If haply by escape
From this one field, thence forward we might live
Immortal and unaging, nor myself
Would risk me thus, nor bid thee with me seek
The glory that such onset brings a man,
But—since ten thousand deadly dooms beset
Our lives, and vain the hope to shun them all,
Let us still onward.”¹

Conflict, incessant and severe, nourishes the manly virtues, but these form only a part, and not the very highest, of man's moral equipment. Among the warlike there is often callousness to pain and suffering, and a heartless disregard of the rights of the poor and weak, especially of women and children. The warrior has little esteem for what are known as the feminine virtues, of patience under injury, forgiveness of enemies, charity of judgment, meekness, and personal humility. It fell to woman to develop the softer side of human nature through the pains and sorrows of motherhood, in accord with the primeval judgment: “In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children” (Gen. iii. 16).

The essential fact in reproduction is the separation of part of the parent organism to start a fresh life, and from first to last the process has been linked with death. In growing unicellular organisms the increase in volume is greater than the increase of surface, and as it is the surface through which the functions of nutrition, respiration, and secretion are carried on, the organism is threatened with physiological difficulties.

¹ *Iliad* xli. 322–328.

To escape disaster the cell divides, halves its mass, gains new surface, restores the balance, and so staves off natural death. Unless killed by violence, these lowly forms of life are immortal. But with more complex organizations, which rise higher and higher in the scale of life, death cannot thus be held at bay: it becomes the Nemesis of reproduction. From the biological point of view, it is not death that makes reproduction necessary to save the species from extinction, but animals die because they have to reproduce. Many organisms die at once on reproducing their kind. The birth of the human child is attended by pain and danger to the mother. Hence the epigrams already quoted, "Death is the price paid for a body," and "Immortality was pawned for Love."

Evolutionists ascribe the full development of the maternal virtues to the long and helpless infancy of the human being. Not for days, or weeks, but for months, as the cry of her infant's helplessness went forth, the mother had to stand between the flickering flame and death. So she became patient. When the child was in trouble, she observed the signs of pain; its cry awakened associations, and in some dull sense she felt with it. So she became sympathetic. From feeling with her child, sooner or later she was led to do something to help it, then to do more things to help it, and finally to be always helping it. Hence carefulness and tenderness. On occasion, sympathy was called out in unusual ways. Crises occurred — dangers, sicknesses, famines. When she rose to the occasion, forgot and denied herself to succor her child, self-sacrifice was born.¹ So woman finds salvation in motherhood (1 Tim. ii. 15). The father, obliged to defend and provide for his wife and children, and to be patient with their weakness and infirmities, also acquired the gentler virtues. These

¹ Drummond, *Ascent of Life*; Fiske, *Cosmic Philosophy*.

are rated very high in the Christian religion. For the strength of Christianity, as St. Paul declares, is above all things a feminine strength. "Its masculine features are recognized as mutable and perishable; prophecies were to fail, tongues were to cease, knowledge was to vanish away, but the strength that seeketh not her own, that suffereth long and is kind, that is not easily provoked, that vaunteth not herself, that beareth, believeth, hopeth, and endureth all things, this was to be the permanent essence, the abiding power of the new evangel."¹ Without the circumstances of infancy, human beings might have become formidable among animals, through sheer force of sharp-wittedness, but they never would have comprehended the meaning of such phrases as self-sacrifice and devotion. The phenomena of social life would have been omitted from the world, and with them the phenomena of ethics and religion; for love of mates is enhanced by love of offspring, and love for offspring eventually broadens out into love for mankind, and for God. True enough, "it is only after ages of social discipline, fraught with cruel affliction and grinding misery, that the moral law becomes dominant, and religious aspiration intense and abiding in the soul," but much can be said to justify the ways of God with men when the lofty moral heights are considered to which pain and sorrow have already lifted mankind.

"I can believe, this dread machinery
Of sin and sorrow, would confound me else,
Devised — all pain, at most expenditure
Of pain by Who devised pain — to evolve,
By new machinery in counterpart,
The moral qualities of Man — how else? .
To make him love in turn and be beloved,
Creative, and self-sacrificing too,
And thus eventually Godlike."

¹ Matheson, *Spiritual Development of St. Paul.*

4. *Pain and the Development of the Spiritual Nature.* It must be confessed that in the study of the origin and development of religions there is very much to complex and sadden, — the age-long and painful gropings of primitive races after God if haply they might find him; their misconception of his nature and character; the appalling cruelties often connected with religious rites and ceremonies; the persecutions and wars perpetrated even in the name of the highest religions; the distance mankind still is from the universal reign of righteousness, love, and peace. This is partly explained by the very great disparity between man as he is originally, and man as God means him to be.

All men are, by nature, "children of wrath," of fierce impulses, and passions hard to restrain; for original sin, according to the evolutionist, is the brute inheritance which every man carries with him.¹ Yet as sin is not imputed where there is no moral law, his first estate is unmoral rather than sinful. For in the earliest stages of human history, man was compelled to be self-assertive, with little or no regard for the rights and welfare of others. If he were not, he went under in the struggle. Having obtained a physical foothold in the world, his further development proceeded in the line of moral growth. With the dawn of moral consciousness, the aggressive self-seeking natural to lower creatures becomes in man actual badness and wickedness. This is his fall. At his best he now learns to care for others beside himself, and to obey laws necessary for the well-being of the community in which he lives.

¹ "The development of the highly complicated doctrine of Original Sin was less the outcome of strict exegesis than due to the exercise of speculation: speculation working indeed on the lines laid down in the Scripture, but applied to such material as current science and philosophy were able to afford" (Tennant, *The Fall and Original Sin*, p. 345).

Then comes the evolution of the spiritual, when the I, the My, the Me, of the mystics, is more and more lost in the willing service and sacrifice of the self, in love of God and man. For personality can reach individual self-satisfaction only through complete individual selflessness. Self-sacrifice is self-realization. On this upward path, man does not travel alone and unaided. The same infinite and eternal Energy from which all things proceed, calls and raises him from his low estate, inspires him with all good thoughts and holy desires, trains him by contact with the world, and by all the experiences of life. As Wallace says, "The love of truth, the delight in beauty, the passion for justice, the thrill of exultation with which we hear of any act of courageous self-sacrifice, are the workings within us of a higher nature, which has not been developed by means of the struggle for existence."

It is God's will that man, in moral character, shall become like unto himself. God is holy, loving, without one selfish thought for himself, whose glory is the goodness and happiness of his creatures. Before man can acquire such a loving, unselfish character, in the degree possible to him, he must pass through the refining fires which transform the natural into the spiritual, and these fires are sorrow and pain. No one can escape this severe discipline without great loss. Even the select souls who are drawn to God almost solely by consideration of his goodness and loving-kindness, must share in their Master's sufferings if they are to be like him. The vast majority of men, however, are not so drawn, but are driven to God by affliction. In the universality of suffering, which must be redeeming even more than it is punitive, lies a great hope for the race, for it points to that divine, far-off consummation towards which the whole creation is moving. God himself is our Redeemer. "All the evils of contrariety and

disorder in fallen nature are only so many materials in the hands of infinite love and wisdom, all made to work in their different ways, as far as possible, to one and the same end, viz., to turn temporal evil into eternal good." The hope of final deliverance from evil is also for the individual, for if the words spoken to Jeremiah the prophet are in a measure true of all, "Before I formed thee I knew thee, and before thou camest forth from the womb, I sanctified thee," then every man is a thought or word of God, and we have the divine promise that no word of God shall return unto him void, but shall accomplish the purpose for which it was sent. At first, there must be a fall or descent of this heavenly thought, word, ideal, or seed into man's earthly nature; there it must be humiliated, and seem to die. At the last, the seed sown in a mortal body will rise immortal; sown disfigured, it will rise beautiful; sown weak, it will rise strong; sown a human body, it will rise a spiritual body. If man is indeed moving towards such a glorious end, the long, dark, and painful stages of the journey may be surveyed with greater equanimity.

First, as to the lowly beginnings of the spiritual life. As defined by Sabatier, religion is "a commerce, a conscious and willed relation into which the soul in distress enters with the mysterious power on which it feels that it and its destiny depend." Religion cannot be said to have its origin solely in either thought, will, or feeling, for any human need or longing may be its starting point, and in its highest form it is a movement of the whole nature towards God and goodness. Still, certain aspects may be considered separately. A prophet of old, weary of himself, weary of trying to put the world right, retired to the wilderness, and there passed through a strange spiritual experience.

A strong and mighty wind passed by, but the Lord was not

in the wind; after the wind an earthquake occurred, but the Lord was not in the earthquake; after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire; and after the fire a still, small voice. When Elijah heard the voice, he wrapped his face in his mantle, and listened to the voice of the Lord. The incident may be taken as a parable, the wind being the symbol of all that is mysterious in nature which appeals so strongly to the emotions; the earthquake suggests inquiry into the forces of nature, and so appeals to the understanding; the fire may be taken as an emblem of the judgments and fiery experiences of life which subdue and refine the will, and bring it into harmony with the will of God. These are not the direct revelations of the Divine, but they lead to where the Divine voice can be heard. For God "makes the winds his angels, and the fiery flames his servants."

(1) *A strong and mighty wind passed by, but the Lord was not in the wind.* Blowing where it listeth, so that men hear the sound thereof, but can not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth, the wind has always been a symbol of the mysterious natural forces by which we are surrounded, the "powers of the air" as they are called in the New Testament; and it is also a symbol of the human spirit with its mysterious origin and destiny, the same word in nearly all languages being used for breath, wind, life, mind, spirit. One of the rudimentary forms of religion is the belief in the existence of ghosts or spirits, and their animation of the visible things of the world. It is a remarkable fact that no people has yet been found who did not or do not believe in the possible existence of the soul apart from the body, the survival of the soul after the death of the body, and in the power of the spirits of the dead to intervene in the affairs of the living. Together with spirits which were the personification of the objects and forces

of nature, these ghosts were held to be the authors of human misfortunes. To appease their wrath, to forestall punishment, to avert calamity generally, resort was had to prayer, sacrifice, and other religious rites and ceremonies. Fear was the impelling emotion. "The religious sentiment is composed first of all of the emotion of fear in its different degrees, from profound terror to vague unconscious uneasiness, due to faith in an unknown, mysterious, impalpable power."¹ Therefore it was pain or the fear of pain which first led men to pray. For a very long while it remained unethical, being offered for long life, health, wealth, victory over enemies, and other material advantages. A familiar instance, in a period comparatively near to us, is the prayer of Jacob: "If God will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then shall Jehovah be my God." And God, who is ever more ready to hear than we are to pray, gives more than is asked. It is the testimony of anthropologists, that, looking on prayer in its effect on man himself through the course of history, it must be recognized as a means of strengthening and purifying emotion, of sustaining courage, and exciting hope. "Even in the life of the rudest savages, religious belief is associated with intense emotion, with awful reverence, with agonising terror, with rapt ecstasy when sense and thought utterly transcend the common level of daily life."²

As men become more spiritual, prayer passes into supplication for the pardon of sin, and at last, in Jesus Christ, it becomes pure communion with the divine. This is God's ideal for man, when prayer is no longer wholly petition for benefits,

¹ Ribot, *The Psychology of the Emotions*.

² Tylor, *Primitive Culture*.

but the fellowship of friend with friend. Not many climb to such spiritual heights of disinterested love. As in dim remote ages, so now, it is pain, fear, and sorrow which usually lead us to the mercy-seat to obtain the grace and strength we sorely need.

“Where is the valley of Man’s Ideal
His trysting-place with the Divine?
It lieth afar between mountains,
And God and his angels are there,
And one is the dark mount of Sorrow,
And one the bright mountain of Prayer.”

Prayer was early accompanied by sacrifice. This was regarded as a gift of supposed value to the heavenly recipient; or the sacrifice was offered as an act of homage; or, as the sense of personal unworthiness deepened, and punishment was felt to be deserved, the offering became propitiatory or even substitutionary, a sacrifice of something greatly valued by the worshiper, or of that which represented this value. It is a melancholy chapter in the history of religious development which deals with the privation and tortures of human beings, either voluntarily or involuntarily borne, to placate angry deities, — the severance of human relationships, the solitude, loneliness, fastings, watchings, the flagellations, wounds and mutilations, the sacrifice of human lives, “yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto demons, and shed innocent blood, even the blood of their sons and their daughters, whom they sacrificed, and the land was polluted with blood” (Ps. cvi. 37-38). Less than twenty-five years ago, when the king of Uganda died, two thousand human beings were sacrificed at his grave. Yet by means of it all the lesson was engraved indelibly on the hearts of barbaric and semi-barbaric men, that sin is a deep offense to heaven and an injury to mankind, and cannot be removed without pain and suffering. The first

great step in the religious life is taken, when the worshiper cries to the object of his adoration: "Take my goods, my health, let me suffer hunger and pain, take even the lives of those dearest to me, and cease to be angry with my sin." Then man is ready for the next stage, when he discerns that the divine favor can be won only by obedience to the moral law. "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" And the prophet of God replies: "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah vi. 6-8). The gift without the giver is bare, and only by the most painful discipline could men learn that gifts and sacrifices cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshiper perfect.

What of those who suffered among the heathen, of those who voluntarily became pathetic object-lessons to their fellow-men, keeping vivid in them the sense of the heinousness of sin, the desperate need of purification, and the necessity and glory of vicarious suffering? If in Christ's words "I thirst" we can believe that "all fiery pangs on battle-fields, on fever beds, where sick men toss, were in that human cry he yields to anguish on the cross," then under the shadow of the cross may be placed all the pain and suffering of imperfect religions.

"Up from undated time they come,
The martyr souls of heathendom,
And to His cross and passion bring
Their fellowship of suffering."

Austerities still have their place in human life. For the sake of others' welfare, the gratification of resentment and other primitive instincts must be denied. Rather than lead the weak and innocent astray, Christ said it was better that a man should lose his right hand or his right eye, for it was more profitable for him, that one of his members perish and not his whole body be cast into hell. And with regard to lesser things, St. Paul declares it is good not to eat flesh or drink wine, nor to do anything whereby a weak brother stumbleth; for the strong must bear the infirmities of the weak, and must often prove their sincerity by cutting themselves off from the ties and pleasures of life.

In the mission field, asceticism raises very difficult and practical questions. As the critics of Christian missions often truly urge, the religious influence of the missionaries might be greatly increased with certain classes, if they lived as the poorest of the natives among whom they labor. If convinced of its wisdom, many missionaries would undoubtedly take this course. Unfortunately, whenever it has been taken, results are doubtful. Usually the health is injured and the missionary either dies, or is compelled to retire from the field. Thus work is closed prematurely, knowledge of the language and ripe experience seems to be wasted, and the church has sustained heavy loss. Further, the spiritual results, as far as human eyes can see, appear to be small. In these days, the strongholds of heathenism cannot be captured by sudden assault in one direction only. Long, patient labor is required, much of it of an undermining character, as the secular side of educational work, and for this there must be physical fitness. Yet the ascetic ideal is regarded wistfully by many a missionary now living a plodding and not uncomfortable existence.

There must also be stern self-discipline in one form or another.

Vol. LXIX. No. 275. 6

other if one's own spiritual life is to be developed. The self-assertion of the earthly nature against the will of perfect love and goodness, which can only bring forth sin and death, must be crucified. "I beat my body under," said the apostle, "lest having preached [self-control] to others, I myself should be a castaway." The gratification of instincts evolved when the struggle for physical existence was keenest, of course gives a feeling of security or pleasure, or the instincts would never have been evolved; and it cannot be easy or pleasurable to suppress these instincts in obedience to moral and spiritual law. But the choice is ever presenting itself between the primal nature, with its self-assertion and the giving of pain, and the new spiritual nature, with its loving self-abandonment and the willing endurance of pain. It is one aspect of Christ's atoning work that in all the circumstances of a sin-stained world he took our human nature and hallowed it. He did no sin, not because he suffered no temptation, but because he crucified in himself all that which in us becomes sin because it is not crucified. "Every pain which answered to the Father's will was the disciplining of some human power which needed to be brought into God's service, the advance one degree further toward the divine likeness, to gain which man was made." The natural resentment against injustice, insult, and cruelty is lost in the cry: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The doubt which assails the mind of the sufferer when the powers of evil seem to triumph, and goodness is defeated, when the Universe seems to be void of life, of purpose, of volition, even of hostility; as if it were one huge, dead, immeasurable, steam-engine rolling on its dead indifference to grind from limb to limb; the state of mind which made the Psalmist cry out: "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" perhaps presented itself to the mind of Jesus in the

darkness of death, but yielded to the mood of perfect resignation: "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Though he was Son, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and our humanity was purified and made perfect by his suffering.

Human nature being what it is, there is no other way to spiritual life, purification, and freedom, than the way of the cross, the dying to self, the way of Jesus. We suffer because we sin; but the converse is also true, we sin because we decline to suffer. Hence all the trials and sufferings of life are to be welcomed for their purificatory value. They are also to be welcomed for the gifts they bring. The tree which can be cast into every Marah making the bitter waters sweet, is just the expectation of finding in all the painful experiences of life that which upbuilds our spiritual nature, and brings nearer the satisfaction of our ideals. So borne, pain brings with it the gifts of fortitude, patience, self-control, wisdom, sympathy, and faith. Of course, "no discipline is pleasant at the time; on the contrary, it is painful. But afterwards its fruit is seen in the peacefulness of a righteous life which is the lot of those who have been trained under it" (Heb. xii. 11). It is a peace which the world can neither give nor take away, for those who have acquired it have overcome the world. Religion may begin with the emotion of fear, but at the last, the perfect love of God casts out all fear.

Apart from the end to be accomplished, however, pain has no such virtue in itself that it is pleasing to the Deity, and meritorious to seek it for its own sake. Primitive peoples believe their gods are the lords of pain, themselves inflicting it with pleasure, and approving of its self-infliction by their devotees. Notions so old, and ingrained in the race, take a long time to disappear. Even among Christians the belief has long

existed that pain in itself is pleasing to God and brings spiritual benefits.

"Let fastings wear out the body; let coarse apparel grieve the flesh; let labor pinch it; let watchings dry it up; let cold make me curl together; let my conscience bark at me; let heat scorch me; let my head ache, my heart burn, let my reins chasten me; let my face look pale; let me be wholly diseased; let my life consume in sorrow; let my years waste in sighing and sobbing; let rottenness lodge within my bones; and let worms crawl under me, if only I may behold Christ and dwell with his saints."¹

Fastings and mortifications so severe as to reduce body and mind to a state of misery, cannot be in accord with the mind and will of Him whose physiological laws are thus broken; and it must be remembered that self-denial is not necessarily the denial of self. Further, extreme asceticism may defeat the very purpose which alone can justify it, by rendering the ascetic incapable of ministering to his fellow-men. Self-preservation and fitness is the corollary of sacrifice for others.

It was the survival of this belief that somehow God derived satisfaction from the sight of human pain which, in the last century, when chloroform was first discovered, and it was given to relieve the pains of maternity, led many very good Christians to regard the procedure as a sinful evasion of God's decree that woman was to bring forth children in pain. Yet anæsthetics are now generally acknowledged to be one of the greatest discoveries of medical science, of inestimable benefit to the whole human race.

The appeal to the example of Jesus Christ as condemning the use of drugs to relieve pain, is not convincing. It is true that when about to be crucified they gave him wine to drink mingled with gall or myrrh, and when he had tasted it he would not drink. But there is no proof that wine so prepared has any anæsthetic effect, except that due to its intoxicating

¹The Contemplation of Christ (1577).

qualities. It was the custom then, as it is in China to-day, to give wine to them that are ready to perish, and so far as the doomed person becomes intoxicated, he is the less sensitive to pain. The reason why Jesus refused the wine may have been because it confused the intellectual faculties, and it does this all the more quickly when the body is in a state of exhaustion from pain and loss of sleep. Later, he alleviated his thirst, which indicates that he did not willingly seek the extremity of suffering, which of itself tends to obtund the mind and senses. In this respect, as in every other, the teachings of the Christian religion show their great superiority. In many primitive religions the priests by the use of narcotic drugs, by wild dancing and screaming, by fastings, contortions, flagellations, cutting the flesh, and other painful means, seek to please the gods, and to produce in themselves an abnormal psychical state akin to hypnotism, in which it is imagined that communication with the gods is easier and more availing. In the infinite love and pity of God, he may condescend to help his backward children who thus draw near to him, but with higher knowledge, the spirit of the prophet must be subject to the prophet. They that worship God must worship him in spirit and in truth.

After all, the suffering deliberately selected by the individual himself, rarely searches and tries the heart, to such a degree as to expose its sinfulness, weakness, and want of faith. It is mainly in the unsought experiences of life, in the pain and suffering for which there is no immediate alleviation or cure, that men find or lose God. Sooner or later, troubles come to all far more severe and searching than those which are self-imposed. St. Paul beat his body under, but the beating did not make him cry out for relief as did the thorn in the flesh which he called an emissary of Satan. For this he besought

the Lord three times that it might depart from him. The prayer was not answered in the way he desired, but he was told that in and through his pain and weakness, divine power would be manifested.

That spiritual power comes through pain is part of the solution which the Christian religion gives of the problem of suffering. Not St. Paul only, but almost every great religious leader has had his own particular thorn in the flesh. Those who dwell in constant communion with God, to whom the things unseen and eternal are more real than the visible and temporal, find for the spiritual nature, for the emotions, imagination, and reason, such unending possibilities of wealth and satisfaction, as to create the danger that the very abundance of the revelations may interfere with the harmonious working of body, soul, and spirit, in their present condition and environment. Hence it is that

"even more perhaps than other kinds of genius, religious leaders have been subject to abnormal psychical visitations. Invariably they have been creatures of exalted emotional sensibility. Often they have led a discordant inner life, and had melancholia during a part of their career. They have known no measure, been liable to obsessions and fixed ideas; and frequently they have fallen into trances, heard voices, and seen visions, and presented all sorts of peculiarities often classed as pathological. Often, moreover, these pathological features in their career have helped to give them their religious authority and influence."¹

These abnormalities, however, if so they must be called, do not invalidate their message. On the contrary, a thorn in the flesh which keeps the soaring religious life in touch with human weakness, pain and mental infirmity, not only gives sympathy, it also gives power. Men do not commonly surrender to the influence and authority of another without good reason, and the reason has to be all the stronger if the person

¹James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*.

exercising authority is abnormal. These men of religious genius derive their power from God through the conquest of pain. They have found the secret of what is so perplexing and distressing to the world, and their victory is manifest in their bearing. Except men see the print of the nails in the hands and feet, they will not believe. The disciple is not greater than his Master. The life and teaching of Jesus Christ would not have appealed to mankind so powerfully if he had not been crucified.

ARTICLE V.

TWO NEW VOLUMES OF THE INTERNATIONAL
CRITICAL COMMENTARY.

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

I. THE MINOR PROPHETS.¹

UNDOUBTEDLY the most extraordinary feature of this volume is the last sentence of the preface, for which the general editors, our old friends Doctors Briggs and Driver, are responsible. This preface is their first joint utterance since the Skinner correspondence, and to appreciate its full force one must remember the various positions that they successively occupied and evacuated in that correspondence. First, they said that they were not responsible if Dr. Skinner had not told the truth. I drove them out of this, indicating that men who purchased volumes of a series that they edited might reasonably hold that professors of standing would not lend their names to anything that was written in deliberate bad faith. After all, no man of honor who edited a series would say, "I do not care whether what is written in these volumes is true or false, composed in good or in bad faith. If anybody chooses to buy or read a book in reliance on my name, that is his affair, not mine. *Caveat emptor*: I recognize no responsi-

¹ A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. By John Merlin Powis Smith, Ph.D.; William Hayes Ward, D.D., LL.D.; Julius A. Bewer, Ph.D. Crown 8vo. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912. \$3.00, *net*.

bility towards a public that trusts me." When this had been driven home sufficiently, our friends decided to abandon the position, and wrote at great length about textual criticism. But they added: "We naturally read the sheets of our contributors and make suggestions upon them, but we do not consider it to be our duty to instruct them how they are to deal with every question which arises." Now they have got hold of yet another conception of their duties, which, apparently, does not involve reading the sheets. Their present position is stated on page iv: "The editors are not responsible for the opinions of the authors or for the details of their work, but only for the choice of the authors and such general supervision of their work as to insure its conformity to the plan of the series." What does this mean? It means, first, that the general editors accept no responsibility whatever for the good faith of the volumes. Good faith is not comprised in the "plan of the series." If one could show that the work on a particular book of the Bible did not include an introduction, or that there was only one set of notes instead of a minimum of two, then indeed "the plan of the series" might be infringed, and the editors might possibly accept responsibility. But if a book is dishonest and deceitful, "the plan of the series" is or may be inviolate, and in that case the editors are entirely satisfied. What do they care how many people may be deceived by works to which they stand sponsors? What concern has the International Critical Commentary or Professor Charles Augustus Briggs or Professor Samuel Rolles Driver with the elements of honor or good faith? So long as they can secure authors who are willing to write introductions and at least two sets of notes, that is all that matters.

But the editorial declaration has other bearings too. In

the correspondence with me they held that it was their duty to secure an author with whose principles they were generally in agreement. But now, "The editors are not responsible for the opinions of the authors." What is the precise force of this? When first I read it, I thought that perhaps the general editors were acquainted with discreditable facts respecting one or more of the authors of books contained in this volume, and were anxious to forestall possible objectors by explaining that they did not hold themselves responsible for the veracity of the gentlemen they were introducing to the public. For all I know there may have been something of the sort at the back of the editorial minds, but another explanation is also possible. Of the three contributors to the volume, one, Dr. Bewer, is the incumbent of a teaching post at the Union Theological Seminary, where Dr. Briggs professes. He has not ventured to commit himself in public to a single word of defense of his colleague's ethical or textual principles. But, on the other hand, his commentary probably contains little that could jar on these. Not so with the other two writers, and their opinions are calculated to cause the general editors acute discomfort. Dr. Smith opens his introduction to Micah with a section on the text which, he says, "has come down to us in a bad state of corruption." "In the correction of MT," he writes later, "LXX is of the most value. It offers a larger number of textual variants than all of the remaining versions combined. In many cases the text presupposed by LXX's rendering is superior to MT. More than one-third of the emendations here adopted are based upon LXX" (p. 5). In a similar spirit Dr. Ward writes on page 19 of his "Habakkuk": "For emendations of the text of chapters 1 and 2 we have had to depend mainly on LXX, but we have occasionally noted another small class of MSS. For ch 3 we fortunately

have more help from this class of MSS., chiefly 23, 62, 86 and 147 of Holmes and Parsons. Two of these are among the more ancient MSS., and one is an uncial. They agree in being based on a text quite variant from MT and so of special value. Cornill says in his *Ezekiel* that 62, 147 are not Lucianic. So Vollers, ZATW., 1883, 4, p. 239, says that this group goes back to '*sehr alte und wertvolle Vorlagen.*'" How such expressions must annoy devotees of the Massoretic text, if they read them! But there is even worse to follow. Dr. Smith uses language that is strongly condemnatory of such conduct as that of his editors. Thus we read: "To 'walk in a spirit of falsehood' and preach lies is to deceive people deliberately, and is far worse than to deceive unwittingly" (p. 63). So it is, but the general editors have no objection to being parties to such deceit. On Micah vi. 12, "And their tongue is deceit in their mouths," he writes as follows: "A vivid way of saying that not a word they speak can be trusted. Lying is a common oriental vice even at the present day" (p. 132). He might have added that it flourishes in Occidental theological chairs. Or, again, take his remarks on Zephaniah iii. 13, "They will not do wickedness, nor will they speak lies": "Sure of themselves and their God, they will have no need to take refuge in lies. This writer evidently sees a vital connection between morality and religion" (p. 252). Such expressions must grate horribly on the general editors if they read them. And yet they suggest something further. For, after all, the views put forward by Dr. Smith have their roots in the texts that he is interpreting, in the Bible itself. The general editors have not gone far enough in repudiating responsibility for the opinions advocated. Next time they write a preface they should add something like this: "The editors are not responsible for the

ethical views and standards advocated by the Biblical writers. They do not seek to translate such views and standards into practice, and have refrained from including them in the plan of the series." Then readers would know where they were.

There is, however, yet another aspect of the editorial declaration which needs attention. The general editors used to read the sheets of their contributors, and make suggestions on them. If therefore they saw anything which they knew to be clearly mistaken, they would presumably mention this to the contributor, and it could be corrected. The new version of their duties excludes this, and accordingly Dr. Smith — who seems to have suffered by this policy — often adopts positions which Dr. Driver knows to be untenable. Thus on Micah iv. 2 (p. 86) he uses expressions about the "sanctuary" that could not be accepted by anybody who knows how unable the members of the Wellhausen school are to defend their theories against my attacks. From the point of view of the higher criticism this line of conduct has great advantages. Silence an adherent of the evolutionary hypothesis, and he can still propagate what he cannot defend by inviting some other adherent of the hypothesis to prepare a volume for a series to which he himself lends his name as general editor. As he holds himself free not to read the sheets or draw his contributor's attention to what he knows to be wrong, everything can go on just as if he had not been silenced. It is unfair to the contributor, but what does that matter to the general editor? The ordinary rules of honor have no application to the higher criticism as interpreted by Doctors Briggs and Driver.

Before passing away from the general editors, attention should be drawn to some of the other ways in which they have scamped their work. It appears that arrangements were made for a commentary on the Minor Prophets as far back as

1890, i.e. something over twenty-one years before the issue of this volume. And yet no engagement is announced for the book of Job. Nobody would wish that a commentary of this kind should be prepared in too great a hurry, but surely twenty-one years of failure to secure a commentator on Job pass all reasonable limits. It is the more striking because the general editors themselves say: "The delay in the preparation of the volumes [on the Minor Prophets] was so great that it seemed best to distribute the work remaining to be done among several scholars." What then about the delay in the preparation of the volume on Job? Or have the general editors discovered something in the poem which is inconsistent with the sacrosanct "plan of the series," and decided to banish it from their canon?

Another matter seems to have caused some qualms to the editors themselves. "The several authors," they write, "have their own special preferences in doing their work, and there are therefore differences in these commentaries such as would have been avoided if any one author had composed them all." Unfortunately that is not the whole truth of the matter, for there are differences of a somewhat inconvenient character *within* the limits of a single author's work. Thus Dr. Bewer, who writes the commentary on two of the prophets treated in this volume, gives a translation of the one (Joel), but not of the other (Obadiah); and Dr. Smith separates his notes on Micah into three separate and distinct commentaries, viz. textual, exegetical, and philological, which are often divided from one another by several pages, but arranges his notes on Zephaniah and Nahum in two divisions. Such divergences could not occur if the series were not so poorly edited.

I come now to the contributors. Each of the three writes

a separate book with its own pagination, and these books are bound together to form the volume. It may be well first to deal with a matter that has already been partly raised — the disposition of Dr. Smith's work. In order to ascertain what he has to say on any particular passage it is often necessary to look at *five* different places. There is first a translation, then a critical commentary, then an exegetical commentary, then footnotes to the last-mentioned, and finally a philological commentary. It is not too much to say that this arrangement does injustice not merely to the readers, but also to the work (often very valuable, and always laborious and conscientious) that Dr. Smith has bestowed on his book. And matters are aggravated by an inconvenient omission, to which any sensible editor would have drawn his attention. His translations are printed without the verse numbers. Hence there is difficulty in following where he has omitted or transposed any portion of the Hebrew text. Time has to be wasted in ascertaining what he has done; whereas, if he had numbered the verses in his translation and adopted suitable symbols for indicating emendations, glosses, etc., the reader's time would be saved, and his task rendered pleasanter. Dr. Smith may be advised to look at a volume of Jebb's "Sophocles" to see what a really well-arranged edition of an author is like. Of course the "plan of the series" would prevent his imitating it in every detail in his forthcoming commentary on Malachi, but he might at least so order matters as to insure that all the notes on a particular passage should be on a single page divided into not more than two groups, and that the translation of that passage should appear at the top of the same page adorned with verse numbers and suitable symbols. Moreover, for the footnotes an inconveniently small type is used which is needlessly irritating. It would therefore be well

to abolish them altogether, incorporating all necessary matter in the text. In this way his work would be displayed to the best advantage.

Apart from matters of technique, Dr. Smith has done a piece of work which a reviewer may honestly praise. He is not a great commentator: he has no outstanding comprehension of the Hebrew prophets: and, unfortunately, he is dominated by some very unsound theories. But he is thorough and honest: he has done a great deal of work at the subject and has succeeded by sheer merit in producing a book that would be a credit to any series. And his difficulties were not slight. Perhaps some readers may suppose that the length of a commentary varies directly with the amount that is known about the authors interpreted, and on learning that Dr. Smith has written nearly 360 pages on Micah, Zephaniah, and Nahum may be tempted to infer that there must be an immense amount of extant knowledge that directly illuminates the scant remains of these prophets; but the opposite would be nearer the truth. The size of a biblical commentary is apt to vary inversely with the amount of knowledge available. For instance, in Zephaniah i. 9 mention is made of the custom of leaping over the threshold. Nobody knows what is meant by this, and Dr. Smith has to devote about a page to the various guesses of interpreters. This is unsatisfying, but is the best that can be done, and in such cases Dr. Smith is conspicuously fair in setting out various opinions without seeking to bias the reader in favor of any particular hypothesis. There are many such excellent notes in his book, alike in the exegetical and in the philological divisions, and there can be no doubt that his work will provide a storehouse of useful knowledge for a long time to come, though perhaps there are too many long discussions of what with our present

knowledge must be regarded as the unknowable. Further there are a number of sensible remarks scattered up and down the work, and sense is not a common characteristic of biblical commentators. Here are a few instances: "Micah, quite as well as a later reader, could carry his figure through to the very end" (p. 73). "May not a prophet descend to prose occasionally? Homer sometimes nods" (p. 74, footnote). "But a fuller knowledge of the history of Israelitish life than is now accessible to us might show other periods when such conditions prevailed" (p. 139). "But surely the prophets were not mere copyists or venders of second-hand goods. Nor was it essential that they should always furnish an invoice of the injuries inflicted upon Israel by a foe; cf Am ii. 1-3. Knowledge of these on the part of the audience might sometimes be taken for granted" (p. 235). "But surely no prophet is to be restricted to the constant reiteration of what he has once said" (p. 244). Such passages are none too frequent in modern books on the Bible, or indeed in the work of Dr. Smith himself. But for those that he has written we must be grateful, and we must hope that they will increase and multiply in his future publications.

Another virtue of Dr. Smith's work is the excellent style of his translations, which produce a very pleasing impression on the reader. I think it might be well to collect and reissue them (with verse numbers, etc.) in a separate form for the benefit of educated readers who would be unwilling to use such a work as the *International Critical Commentary*. A modern scholarly translation of the Bible is badly wanted, and Dr. Smith obviously possesses a combination of qualities which render him unusually well fitted to contribute to such a work. Few of the writers in this series can produce renderings that would compare with his for literary excellence.

Indeed, it may be said generally of the book that it is good enough to make one regret that it is not much better. It easily might have been. Dr. Smith is unfortunately under the influence of certain fixed ideas which are false in themselves and prejudice his work severely. In the true spirit of the anti-historical school he sets up standards to which history and prophecy are expected to conform, and deals ruthlessly with anything that cannot be twisted into conformity with them. Of his higher critical views it may be said that the majority would probably never have been put forward at all if he could have realized that Hebrew prophets were not German theological professors. He is not always consistent with himself; e.g. on pages 32 f. Micah i. 7 is declared to be spurious, and this view is adopted on page 37, but in the philological notes on this very verse (p. 40) we are told that the use of a particular word "here is seen to be paronomasia, very characteristic of Micah." Obviously Dr. Smith had forgotten all about his higher criticism when he wrote this note. A more serious instance occurs in his treatment of Nahum, to whom he is conspicuously unjust on pages 280 f. Thus on page 281 the obligations of Israel according to Nahum are laid down, and we are told of the duty to eschew foreign cults and perform the cultus of its God, etc.; but in the commentary the only passage relating to this is treated as spurious. On page 309 it is said that i. 11, together with certain subsequent verses, is "the first of the genuine oracles of Nahum," ii. 1, "celebrate thy feasts, O Judah, fulfil thy vows," having been previously declared "a later addition to the prophecy of Nahum" (pp. 302 ff.). The two views do not hang together. If Nahum wrote only the passages that Dr. Smith regards as genuine, then he has no right to attribute to him ideas that are set forth only in passages that

he regards as spurious. And, as I have touched on his treatment of Nahum, let me say at once that it is an excellent example of the extreme folly — the word is not too strong — of his method. Having reduced the extant works of Nahum to something under two pages of his own translation (which on his own view deal simply with a single topic), he proceeds to denounce the prophet in unmeasured language for not having dealt with other topics: "In Nahum, a representative of the old, narrow and shallow prophetism finds its place in the Canon of Scripture. His point of view is essentially one with that of such men as Hananiah (Jer xxviii), the four hundred prophets in opposition to Micaiah ben Imlah (1 K xxii), and the so-called 'false prophets' in general" (p. 281). How does he arrive at this conclusion? First he banishes from the book everything that does not bear directly on the destruction of Nineveh. Then he assumes that Nahum never said, did, or thought anything save what is contained in the few extant sentences that he concedes to him, and this leads him to exclaim triumphantly, "He can, he will see nothing else" (p. 280). By precisely the same reasoning it could be shown that Nahum never ate, drank, or breathed, and that his sojourn in the world was strictly limited to the time necessary for the writing of the two pages that Dr. Smith assigns to him. "He could, he would do nothing else." If Dr. Smith refuses to accept this conclusion, then he must abandon the suppressed premise of his present reasoning, viz. that nothing was thought or done or said that is not reported in the scanty extant fragments of Hebrew literature.

The foregoing is an extremely strong instance of the method pursued — but it is only an instance. Similar assumptions run through the whole of the higher critical work on the prophets treated by Dr. Smith. "Bricks without straw"

is the comment that constantly forces itself into the reader's mind. And if such tacit assumptions where there is a partial or total failure of evidence constitute one weakness of the book, other assumptions which are used to override all the available evidence provide another. Does an inconvenient phrase occur in four preëxilic passages when Dr. Smith desires to assign it to "the exilic and post-exilic circle of ideas"? What can be easier than to say — without a scrap of evidence — that these passages are "due to interpolation"? (p. 86). It is amusing to note that in the very next volume of the series issued, a fellow-member of the anti-historical school, Dr. G. B. Gray, contradicts the idea that the phrase is late, and accepts at least three of these very "interpolations" as genuine.¹ Or, again, take Dr. Smith's constant assumptions that monotheism must be late, as also the idea that the heathen would worship the God of Israel. Such assumptions are the constant marks of the anti-historical school, which sweeps from the biblical record everything that does not tally with certain preconceived ideas.

Where the interpretation of a chapter requires real insight, Dr. Smith is, of course, quite at fault: but I confess that I do not understand why in Micah vii. 6–10 he failed to see that the speaker, having a feminine "enemy" and being the antecedent of the feminine "thy" in verse 10, must herself be feminine. The passage is best understood as spoken in continuation of verses 1–7. For some reason Dr. Smith cannot understand verse 7. "The original connection of this verse with another context is shown by the manner in which it evidently contrasts 'I' with something that has gone before, though there is no fitting contrast in the present context" (p. 145). "In my present plight I, Zion, impersonat-

¹ *Isaiah*, vol. i. p. 44.

ing the idealism of the community, will, in contrast to the undesirable sons, daughters, etc., already referred to, put my trust in God Who will hear me." And then follows the apostrophe of the "enemy." If this train of thought appears unnatural or improbable to Dr. Smith, I can only reply that to a Jewish mind nothing could be more natural. Indeed, I can honestly say that his difficulty has no meaning at all to me. It only shows that he lacks the necessary sympathy with the Hebrew mind to grasp what is instinctive to it. Why has not Dr. Smith made more extensive use of the commentary on Micah by Dr. Margolis, who knows what he is talking about?¹ In brief notes which do not raise unnecessary difficulties, that commentator makes perfectly clear what Dr. Smith cannot comprehend. Thus on verse 1 he writes, "The prophet speaks in the name of the community." On verse 6 he explains the trend of thought further: "The idea underlying these expectations is that evil must have run its course before the good can come. The hope in the triumphant advent of the Kingdom of God is intensified by the very contemplation of the evil as it exists. When the moral corruption is greatest, salvation is surest; or, as the rabbis say, 'out of distress cometh relief.'" He then quotes from Friedmann, "The hope in the regeneration of the world after a period of greatest physical and moral evil is deeply implanted in the Jewish soul"; and continues: "This thought dominates the present passage, and is expressed in phraseology which antedates the prophets. Hence the seemingly sudden transition to the hopeful vision, verse 7 ff., where the prophet speaks for the 'remnant' (verse 18), the ideal community which,

¹The Holy Scriptures, with Commentary. Micah. By Max L. Margolis, Ph.D. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America. 1908.

when freed from its own sin, is destined to triumph over the nations now rejoicing in its downfall." I cannot conceive why Dr. Smith, having at hand so excellent a guide, should have neglected to avail himself of his services to the fullest extent.

The textual criticism of the book is distinguished by marked excellences. It is very thorough. A particularly pleasing feature is the use made of the collations of Kennicott and de Rossi. It is the fashion in some quarters at present to underrate the assistance that may be derived from these, but in this respect Dr. Smith is no follower of the mode, and a perusal of his *apparatus criticus* must satisfy any impartial reader that there exists a large number of passages where the variants recorded by one or more Hebrew MSS. receive versional support. Such cases naturally enhance and control the value of the Versions. On the other hand, Dr. Smith's own treatment of the text is often hazardous and arbitrary; but in his case this can scarcely be called a defect, because he is so conspicuously fair about it. "The translation here given," he writes in his exegetical notes on Nahum i. 10, "rests upon a text which is confessedly largely conjectural, and, as with all guesses, the chances are against it" (p. 294). There can be no reasonable objection to any textual criticism that is conducted in this spirit, for every reader is fully warned that he is dealing with conjectures, and is free to form his own opinion. It is only by the steady multiplication of various conjectures that progress can be made.

The little commentary on Habakkuk by Dr. Ward need not detain us. It is one of the feeblest contributions to the International Critical Commentary, and suffers from the inevitable comparison with the other two books bound up in this volume. A couple of instances of his methods may be cited. The intro-

duction contains no section on the literature of the book (is not this omission contrary to the "plan of the series"?); and in i. 13 the first half of the verse (R.V. "Thou that art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and that canst not look on perverseness") is ignored without a word of explanation alike in the translation and in both sets of notes. Perhaps this is due to an oversight; but such oversights do not testify to any great expenditure of *câre*. The scale of the commentary is slighter and less elaborate than that of the companion publications.

The third writer, Dr. Bewer, is a German, and he must be heartily congratulated on the mastery he has acquired of his adopted language. In reading his book I noticed very few turns of phrase that would betray the fact that English is not his mother-tongue to even a close observer who was ignorant of the fact. His work is somewhat less thorough and comprehensive than that of Dr. Smith, but it is more original: and in his general learning Dr. Bewer is well up to the normal standard of the series. Unfortunately he too is a member of the anti-historical school, and shares its prejudices and faults of method to a very full extent. He has not the slightest shadow of an idea of what evidence means, holding apparently that his *ipse dixit*, especially if printed in italics, is sufficient to establish any proposition. With such a man one cannot attempt to argue, and it merely remains to warn readers of some of the characteristics of the book.

Like Dr. Smith, Dr. Bewer is unable to tell a consistent story. For instance, on page 59 we are told that a supposititious editor to whom he attributes Joel iv. 2b, 3, "does not even think of N. Israel in his picture of the golden future": but when in the commentary he comes to deal with the

reference to Israel contained in this passage, he writes, "Whether also the north Israelitish dispersion is included, we cannot tell, but it is likely" (p. 129). How, it may be asked, does it come about that on page 59 Dr. Bewer can be dogmatically certain that a hypothetical personage was not thinking of what on page 129 he treats as "likely" to have been present to his mind? The answer is of course to be sought for in the present condition of biblical studies, when anybody can make a reputation by the means adopted by Dr. Bewer in this volume. Lay down a theory first, and then invent reasons; and, provided your theory is sufficiently remote from all the known facts, you will be regarded by the critics as a great scholar.

I think it unlikely that anybody will trouble to refute Dr. Bewer's higher critical views in detail. It would be difficult to find weaker reasoning anywhere than that on pages 57 f. Most readers should be able to see through it for themselves. Who, for example, will take at its face value the statement that "it appears that every single member of the people can attend the assembly at the temple"? Dr. Bewer's difficulties flow in part from his preconceptions. Thus, he makes Joel i. 15 an interpolation, with the result that he has to admit, in commenting on verses 16-20, that they are incomplete.

On the other hand, it is pleasant to be able to note that his originality is sometimes stimulating. His introduction to Obadiah is unfortunately too hysterical in parts, but considerable interest attaches to his view of the interpretation of the book: and his exegesis of Joel ii. 15-17 is certainly worthy of consideration. It is a pity that theologians are not given a training which would fit them better to conduct investigation: I have often regretted it, and when I see how much harm the present system has done to a man of Dr. Bewer's

freshness of mind, my regrets are intensified. In some ways he is so far above the level of the ordinary German theological professor that one cannot help feeling sorry that he has not been trained better. However, even as it is, he may quite fairly be said to have contributed something considerable to the understanding of the authors of whom he has treated, and to have produced some of the most original work in the series.

II. ISAIAH.¹

This volume from the pen of a well-known Oxford critic followed the American volume at an interval of only a few weeks, and presents some very curious contrasts to it. Its best feature, the comparative moderation of tone which characterizes it, is a case in point. Like the authors of the volume on the Minor Prophets, Dr. Gray belongs to the critical school which at one time appeared to be triumphant; but, unlike them, he has apparently come to feel that there is a possibility that he may be wrong. Of course he does not yet believe that he is wrong; but there is a moderation of tone about the book, and more especially about the introduction, which almost leads me to think that a day may yet come when it will be possible to reason with Dr. Gray as with an ordinary man who does not claim plenary inspiration for all his theories. One other point of contrast is also in favor of the Englishman, — a recognition, slight and hesitating, it is true, but still genuine in its way, that there may be such a

¹ A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX. By George Buchanan Gray, D.D., D.Litt., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Mansfield College, Oxford. XL-LXVI. By Arthur S. Peake, D.D., Rylands Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester. In two Volumes. Vol. I. Introduction, and Commentary on I-XXVII. Crown 8vo. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912. \$3.00.

thing as human nature. Dr. Gray is probably the only commentator on a Hebrew prophet who has ever introduced the word "maffickers" into his work (p. 364); and while I confess that I laughed very heartily when I saw it, and wondered whether Oxford theologians attend bump suppers, or dance round bonfires on Guy Fawkes day, yet I cannot help seeing that its occurrence is a good sign in the work of a writer of the anti-historical school. Dr. Gray, of all men, requires sympathy with human nature to improve his work; for it is the case with him, even more than with most members of the school, that his interests are predominantly philological. On the other hand, his work is not on the whole as good as the best parts of the companion volume. If it was his object to prove that he could write very much worse English than the German contributor, he has certainly succeeded uncommonly well. There is nothing in Dr. Bewer's work that can be compared to such a word as "insensitivity" (p. 109), and a rendering of Isaiah that includes such expressions as "shed-blood" (p. 7), "a binder up" (pp. 61, 65), "yelpers," "shriekers" (p. 237) can hardly be put by the side of the American volume. Here are a couple of examples of Dr. Gray at his worst:—

"Ah!

The booming of many peoples!

Like the booming of seas they boom!" (xvii. 12).

"Ah! land of the whirring (?) of wings,

Which is beyond the rivers of Cush!

Which sendeth envoys (?) on the sea,

And ^ vessels of papyrus on the face of the water.

"Go, ye fleet messengers,

To a nation tall (?) and of polished appearance (?),

To a people terrible. . .

A nation mighty (?) and down-treading,

Whose land rivers dissect (?)." (xviii. 1, 2.)

Well may Dr. Gray write in his preface, "I have aimed at making my translations the pivot of the Commentary; apart from it they have, indeed, little claim to consideration; I have deliberately, where necessary, sacrificed form and style, in order to make them as expressive as possible of what I understand the Hebrew text to mean, but also of the numerous uncertainties which appear to me at present to beset the text." Whether a translation couched in such terms is not more likely to defeat its own object than to attain any other purpose is of course a matter of opinion.

In treating of a volume of the bulk of this book, it is not feasible to do more than pick out a few topics for discussion. A certain amount of space is devoted to textual criticism, and here Dr. Gray writes in a manner that is calculated to reassure Dr. Barton and others whose devotion to faith is characterized by blind zeal rather than knowledge or intelligence. In the course of his discussion he writes some sentences that must be quoted. "We must then reckon with the possibility of mis-copying, whether we follow the Jewish recension of the Hebrew text or whether we follow the LXX, and we have no more ground for refusing to consider the evidence of the LXX, because the translators sometimes misread their original, than we have for refusing to consider the evidence of the Jewish recension of the Hebrew text." And then he adds a footnote which, coming as it does from the pen of an eminent Christian divine, may be heartily commended to Dr. Barton and those who may be disposed to agree with him: "Mr. Ottley, indeed, would meet this by a dogmatic consideration, 'Some minds, moreover, will still not refuse to entertain the idea that the Heb. text has been guarded, not only by the watchful care of the Jews, but also by the special providence of the Almighty' (ii. p. xvii). Yet even if dog-

matic considerations were in place here at all, it is difficult to see why the Almighty granted to the text of the Jews a special Providence which He withheld from the Greek Text, which became the Bible of the Christian Church" (pp. xxvii, xxviii). That is the answer of a Christian theologian to the theory that the scientific use of the LXX is destructive of faith. I had already answered the charge from a Jewish point of view as far back as April, 1910. It will be interesting to see whether Dr. Barton will dare to say anything more on the subject, or whether he will continue to maintain the unbroken silence of the last two years.

In spite of my approval of Dr. Gray's general attitude towards textual criticism, I regret to say that I am wholly unable to commend the use he has made of the materials in this volume. His labors in this field fall very far short of the work done by some of the other writers in the series, e.g. H. P. Smith on Samuel, or G. F. Moore on Judges. In his preface Dr. Gray writes that he might be more satisfied if he could feel that two or three important fields of inquiry were really worked out, and he gives, as the first instance of this, the state of the text, adding that he is persuaded that the evidence of the Greek Version has not been as yet completely and accurately sifted. For this conviction he has the best of grounds; but his dissatisfaction is utterly unreasonable, having regard to the very perfunctory manner in which he has used the available materials. I doubt whether he has used the cursives at all; certainly he has not made the faintest attempt to group the various MSS. or trace the recensions; while, from the way in which he cites an article of my own, I feel inclined to suggest to him that he should now set out to read it carefully. I do not think that a commentator who has spent so little labor on the matter as Dr. Gray

is justified in complaining that the study is still in so incomplete a condition. It is open to his readers to retort, "Well, you might at any rate have tried to advance it a little yourself."

On the question of Hebrew metre Gray's remarks are sane and interesting; and, as already hinted, he is more at home in the philological portion of his subject than in any other. His ideas of date and development are of course hopelessly vitiated by his adherence to untenable theories.

With regard to the mechanical portion of the book, the criticisms of the American volume are applicable to this with almost equal force; but it must be reckoned to Dr. Gray for righteousness that he has printed his translations in very much better type than his colleagues. The sheets of this volume have been read by Dr. Driver, but it does not appear that Dr. Briggs has had anything to do with them. Still, in view of Dr. Driver's share in the production of the book, it is very interesting to find "*God* hath heard" adopted as the true reading of the explanation of the name Ishmael in Gen. xvi. 11 (p. 128). It is remarkable that no hint is here given that the Massoretic text has been silently abandoned in favor of a variant the correctness of which was expressly disputed by the general editors in writing to me. If this means that Doctors Gray and Driver now agree with me, I can only express my unqualified satisfaction.

Apart from his acceptance of certain preposterous higher critical theories, and the absurdities into which they lead him, Dr. Gray kicks over the traces really badly in one place only. On page 256, in the course of a note on xiv. 13, he writes of the Tent of assembly (i.e. the Tabernacle), that it "may originally have meant a tent for the assembly of the gods, though to the Hebrews it came to bear quite another mean-

ing (Ex 33 7-11), and may have had a connection with the Babylonian conception of the World-Mountain piercing into heaven, where the gods assembled to determine destinies." The probative and scholarly value of this remark may be exactly paralleled as follows: "'Dr. Gray' may originally have meant a mermaid, though to the readers of the International Critical Commentary it came to have quite another meaning, and may have had a connection with the English conception of the great sea-serpent, which generally attains to fame in the gooseberry season." The one sentence is not more preposterous than the other.

Of course Dr. Gray is apt to make a mess of things through his literary incompetence. For instance, in vi. 1 he insists on rendering "skirts" for train, and after speaking of it as "æsthetically unsatisfactory" in English goes on to discuss the anthropomorphism. All I can see in this is a proof of incompetence to edit a poet. Either a man sympathizes with a poet's methods of expression and comprehends them instinctively, or else he does not, and Dr. Gray unfortunately falls in the latter category. There is here no question of philology or anthropomorphism. The idea is closely parallel to that contained in Wordsworth's

"But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home."

A note on this passage explaining that trailing could be appropriately used of the way in which a tired child will drag along an umbrella with its ferrule in the dust would be as much in place as this note on Isaiah. Another instance of what this egregious commentator can effect in literary matters is to be found on page 107, where we read, on vi. 4, "whether a heavenly temple would have quaked at what in

a heavenly temple should have been an ordinary occurrence, may be doubted"! It is a pity that Dr. Gray was not a contemporary of those old Russian theologians who used to dispute as to whether the angels reasoned by synthesis or analysis!

The blind acceptance of theories that are absurd and untenable is very marked, and in some places Dr. Gray overreaches himself in a curious manner. Thus, on the words "the Law and the Testimony" (viii. 20), he gives away the critical case entirely by saying that if the verse is late, Torah may mean written law (p. 159). Here we have a plain instance of the way in which the evidence is "faked" by the critics in the interests of the postdating of the Pentateuch. The word may have its natural meaning if the verse be postdated; otherwise this must be denied to it in the interests of a theory. Another monstrous piece of work is the treatment of the idea of holiness. Alike in the introduction (p. lxxxix) and the commentary (p. 106) we are invited to believe that the term was originally devoid of all moral import and "ethicised by Isaiah." Of course for this remarkable allegation dependence must to some extent be placed on the assigning of large sections of the Pentateuch (including Lev. xix.) to a late age; but, even so, the allegation will not stand. The original offer of the covenant contains language that is perfectly clear on the point: "And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Ex. xix. 6). The first terms of the covenant are the ten commandments. Amos (ii. 7) speaks of a highly immoral act as profaning God's *holy* name—thus clearly showing the connection between holiness and moral conceptions—and makes God swear by his 'Holiness' (iv. 2). If Dr. Gray had considered the matter before writing on the subject, he might have been led to

ask whether an Amos who equates seeking the Lord with seeking good attached no ethical meaning to that attribute by which the Lord himself swears. There is therefore no doubt that the word had (*inter alia*) ethical associations before the time of Isaiah.

I conclude with a few words about a great passage the true and full import of which it is impossible for Dr. Gray to realize without legal assistance, of which, like the other members of this school, he of course fails to avail himself — I mean Isaiah xix. 18 ff. The long study of covenants which forms the second chapter of my "Studies in Biblical Law" is probably beyond Dr. Gray's comprehension, and so I must try and put the gist of the matter, so far as it relates to this passage of Isaiah, into language that he may be able to understand. The whole of modern business rests on contract, i.e. on agreements which are recognized as binding, and enforced by the courts. But this idea of contract is a conception that came gradually and at a relatively late stage in human progress. When there are no courts there can be no question of agreements enforceable by them. Yet occasions will arise when men will feel the need of some form of binding engagement. How is this to be supplied? If we interrogate legal history we shall see how it in fact was supplied: "The greatest gap in ancient civil law will always be caused by the absence of Contract, which some archaic codes do not mention at all, while others significantly attest the immaturity of the moral notions on which Contract depends by supplying its place with an elaborate jurisprudence of Oaths" (Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 369). Oaths are the natural solution of the difficulty not only in the stages of history that give birth to the early codes, but also in those more primitive and loosely knit societies which can have no codes because they have no

courts. The agreement depends for its sanction on supernatural powers whose aid is invoked to watch over its fulfilment. Such oaths might or might not be entered into with sacramental or other rites. Among the ancient Hebrews, as among many other ancient nations, we find, as a matter of fact, that a number of different rites were sometimes observed in connection with the pledging of such oaths. Sometimes, not in all cases. Hebrew had a special term which was applied to such transactions, the term which is usually rendered by the word "covenant." Covenants might be of different kinds, i.e. they might be entered into with different ceremonies. We have no information which would enable us to say when each particular kind was in place, but we do know a little about the ceremonies observed in one or two instances. In some cases striking parallels are to be found among other peoples. Now among these various kinds of covenants two are of particular importance for the history of Israel, of religion, and of literature, and it is these two that enter into the consideration of this passage of Isaiah. From certain terms employed I have ventured to designate these respectively as "pillar-covenants" and "token-covenants." In the pillar-covenant we find that the transaction consists of oaths between the parties combined with the erection of an altar and a *mazzebah* (ordinarily rendered "pillar" or "obelisk"), the offering of sacrifices and the eating of a sacrificial meal. The classical instance of such a covenant is to be found in Genesis xxxi. 44-54, where Jacob and Laban enter into one. So far there is nothing remarkable or exceptional. But the next step is without parallel in history. The form of covenant is taken bodily, with only such modifications as the changed circumstances necessitate, and utilized to create the special relationship between God and the Israelitish tribes. The one pillar becomes twelve, according

to the number of the tribes. Representative elders and Moses as go-between are utilized to perform the functions which the people as an unwieldy entity could not perform like a party to an ordinary covenant between individuals. But all the elements are there — the altar, the sacrifice, the pillars, the feast. And the oath? Here a difficulty arose that gave rise to a special literary form. For what is an oath? It is either a declaration or a promise combined with a *jurat*, i.e. an appeal to a supernatural power.¹ The promissory oath is of course the only kind to require consideration in this connection. About the terms of the promise no difficulty arises. They are as bilateral as in any contract in the world. Israel is to receive certain privileges and in return is to do certain things. But the *jurat* is more difficult. There is no supernatural Power outside the covenant to whom the parties can appeal to watch over its due performance, for the Greatest of all powers is Himself a party to the covenant. And so there is no ordinary *jurat*, no appeal to the God of their fathers or the Fear of Isaac. But, in place thereof, we find a Divine discourse enjoining obedience and promising rewards for it, while threatening punishment for the reverse. And so it comes about that a large portion of Israel's law consists of the terms of sworn agreements made between God and Israel. Of the uniqueness of the literary form I cannot here speak, but must content myself with referring my readers to the chapter of "Studies in Biblical Law" of which I have already spoken, and my article "Law in the Old Testament," in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary, with which, so far as I am aware, no higher critic has any acquaintance at all. But its technical terms and its importance for history and religion

¹ See, further, my article on "Oaths in the Old Testament," in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary.

Vol. LXIX. No. 275 8

are germane to our passage. The pillar in the Jacob-Laban covenant had been a witness; and, to this day, it is the function of any written document embodying a contract to witness its existence and terms. In the covenant document which constitutes the bulk of the book of Deuteronomy we find the word "testimonies" repeatedly employed for the same reason, and consequently we must recognize that the word had a technical or quasi-technical usage in connection with covenants. If now we turn to the passage of Isaiah, we shall find (ver. 25) that Egypt is at some future time to be God's people on a level with Israel itself, and if we read the preceding verses we shall find all the elements of the Sinaitic covenant ceremony. Swearing and altar, sacrifice (which implies a meal), and the pillar which is to be for a witness, all are there. And there is yet another significant word. The *mazzebah* is also to be for a token. This is a technical term of another kind of covenant, — the kind which had been employed in the covenant with Abraham which is narrated in Genesis xvii. Now the special relationship of Israel to God rests partly on this (to this day initiation into this covenant is indispensable for the Jewish boy), and partly on the covenants of the Mosaic age, and the prophet uses language which designedly covers both. The meaning is that Egypt is to become as completely entitled to a place besides Israel, and to parity of relationship to God, as if it too had been a party to the covenants with Abraham and the tribes in the wilderness. It is a mistake to press the language and ask for geographical details in connection with altar or pillar or cities. The prophet does not necessarily mean that there will be an actual physical altar or pillar — indeed, in my opinion, he does not mean that at all. Assyria, which is mentioned in this passage, is to be a third merely in virtue of the fact that it is the work of

God's hands. The real gist of the prophecy is that the privileges and special position of Israel will be extended to the world at large, and no literal meaning should be assigned to the specific formalities mentioned.

Altogether Dr. Gray's book would properly be described, in the language of "maffickers" (a form of speech that is unsurpassed for simple directness) as "pretty rotten."

ARTICLE VI.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID FINDLEY BONNER, D.D.,
ENDICOTT, NEW YORK.

INDUSTRIAL conditions throughout our land to-day are by no means satisfactory. Capital and Labor are not in harmony. Indeed, not a few aver that they are actually at war. As a result, the normal processes of production are often interrupted, investments in the disturbed industries often become temporarily unproductive, wages in those industries largely or wholly cease, and the general public in various ways suffers.

These conditions should not be permitted to become permanent. Some adjustment of the conflicting demands of Capital and Labor must be discovered. Some system must be devised by which Capital will be assured reasonable interest, and at the same time Labor be assured a living wage. The discovery of that system is the industrial problem of the day.

For the solution of the problem the Christian instinctively turns to the teachings of the Prophet of Galilee. He is the more disposed to take this course for the reason that it is largely through the teachings of Jesus that the problem has arisen. It is to the teachings of Christianity in respect to the dignity of manhood that the dissatisfaction of the masses with existing conditions is largely due. These have brought to them a conception of their rights and privileges. It remains

to lead them to recognition of their duties and responsibilities. With mutual recognition on the part of both Capital and Labor of their reciprocal duties and obligations, as well as their respective rights and privileges, the industrial problem would soon be solved, and the conflicts which now occur so frequently would cease.

It is due to the nature of the religion of Jesus that this solution has not already been discovered. Christianity is not a religion of precepts, but of principles. It is not a system of statutes, but of ideals. These ideals are differently conceived, these principles differently applied. It will not be till these ideals are rightly apprehended, and these principles are rightly recognized and justly applied, that the conflict will cease.

Hence, so long as the problem remains unsolved — so long as a system securing harmony between capital and labor remains undiscovered, every earnest study of the teachings of the religion of Jesus, as they bear upon the labor problem, should be welcomed. It is in this spirit that the present paper is submitted. It will be a strictly inductive study. No attempt will be made to state ideal conditions as the writer conceives them. No attempt will be made to justify such ideals by appeal to the teachings of Christ or his Apostles. On the contrary, the effort will be, by inductive study, to ascertain, if possible, what are the teachings of Jesus and his Apostles, as they bear upon these questions, as historically presented in the New Testament Scriptures. These teachings fall into three stages of development. There is, first, the ministry of John the Baptist; then the personal ministry of Jesus; and, finally, the ministry of the Apostles. To each of these, in turn, appeal will be made.

THE MINISTRY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.

John the Baptist came announcing the coming of the kingdom of heaven. Whatever may have been implied in that phrase, it undoubtedly denoted a new social order and a beneficent change in all human relationships. All classes of people recognized this fact; and hence came to John and asked what they should do. Only one of the replies given by him to these questions now concerns us. It is that returned to the soldiers, and was as follows: "Extort from no man by violence, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages" (Luke iii. 14). Interpreting this utterance broadly, as universally applicable to all classes of laborers, it must be confessed that this first message of the coming kingdom falls harshly upon the ears of the toiling masses. It seems to mean only repression, and subjection to existing conditions. But this is an impression begotten by bondage to the letter, and blindness to the spirit, of the message. John assumes that the wages given were a reasonable compensation for service, and a sufficient provision for maintenance. Being such, efforts through violence and blackmail to increase income were to be abjured. The coming kingdom is to be founded on reason and righteousness. Hence resort to violence to secure desired conditions is forbidden by the very spirit of the kingdom. What should be done in case the assumption respecting wages is mistaken is not here stated. That will appear later. The one principle here announced, and an important one it is, is that laborers are not to resort to violence or blackmail — by fair inference, are not to resort to any criminal or unethical means — to increase their income or in any way better their condition. This rules out all strikes, with their usual accompaniment of violence,

on the part of labor; and, by parity of reasoning, all resort to lockouts on the part of capital.

THE PERSONAL TEACHING OF JESUS.

The first utterance of Jesus himself that bears in any way upon the labor question is found in the *commission given to the Twelve Apostles*; and the second is found in the very similar *commission given to the Seventy Disciples* sent out somewhat later. There is but little in these commissions which has a direct bearing upon the industrial problem; but what little there is, is instructive. Several things about the commissions are very suggestive. The commission issued to the Apostles is found in the tenth chapter of the Gospel by Matthew, and parallel passages in the Gospels by Mark and Luke.¹ That to the Seventy is found only in the Gospel by Luke;² for he alone records the mission. These commissions are very similar: and, for our present purpose, with a single exception, may be regarded as identical. Studying these commissions from our present standpoint, we note the following things: (1) These missionaries were to throw themselves entirely upon those to whom they were sent. They were to take no extra clothing, and were not to carry with them any money. (2) They were to render to those to whom they were sent beneficent and efficient service. They were to proclaim the kingdom, heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out demons. It was a gracious service they were to render, embracing both body and soul. (3) They were not to measure their service by the amount of their compensation. Freely they had received, freely they were to give. (4) And yet they were entitled to compensa-

¹ Matt. x. 1-15; Mark iii. 13-19; vi. 7-11; Luke vi. 13-16; ix. 1-6.

² Luke x. 1-12.

tion, and ordinarily would receive it. In case any community declined their service they were to withdraw from that community; and, in leaving, they were to make formal protest against its inhospitality.

These commissions having been given to gospel workers, and with reference to religious and spiritual labors, the question arises, What bearing have they upon the general industrial problem of to-day? Manifestly they have an application to Christian work and workers¹ which they do not have to laborers in general; and yet on the labor problem, in its widest aspects, they have a bearing. There is in each of these commissions an expression of universal and permanent application to the labor question. They are those in reference to the compensation of the laborer. In the commission to the Seventy the statement is, "The laborer is worthy of his hire." The word "hire" is not a felicitous one. We associate hire with contract. There is stipulated service for stipu-

¹ It is outside the purpose of this paper to discuss the religious bearings of these instructions; and yet a few words may not be out of place.

The question necessarily arises, Are these instructions of universal and perpetual obligation? Are all missions to be what are known as "Faith Missions"? Before attempting to answer this question categorically, four things must be observed: 1. These missionaries were sent exclusively to their own countrymen and coreligionists; 2. These missions were temporary and exceptional. The Apostles were thus sent forth only during the Galilean ministry. The Seventy¹ simply arranged for the final journey to Jerusalem; 3. Instructions other than these were later given in regard to future work (Luke xxii. 35); 4. These instructions were not literally followed by the Apostles in their work subsequently to the Ascension of their Lord. Manifestly, then, these instructions were not to be literally permanently followed. And yet it may be questioned whether a closer observance of the spirit of these instructions, on the part of modern evangelists, would not be for the glory of God and the good of the kingdom.

lated compensation. The Seventy were not thus hired by those to whom they were sent. The word here rendered "hire" occurs twenty-nine times in the original. In the Authorized Version it is rendered "wages" twice, "hire" three times, and "reward" twenty-four times. In the Revised Versions — both American and British — it is rendered "wages" once, "hire" seven times, "reward" twenty-one times. In the 1911 Bible it is rendered "hire" twice, "wages" four times, and "reward" twenty-three times. Evidently, then, as understood by the best authorities, the general thought of the word is reward. Such should have been the rendering here. The laborer is worthy of his reward. The corresponding statement in the commission to the Apostles, as given by Matthew, carries the matter one step further. There the language is: "The laborer is worthy of his food," as the Revisions have it; or, "The workman is worthy of his meat," as the Authorized Version and the 1911 Bible have it. The phrasing is immaterial, as, in either rendering, the general thought is maintenance. The expression suggests the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread." That is all we are taught to ask from God in this regard. But that we are to seek, and for that we are to pray. This daily bread, however, is not merely the supply needed to sustain life.¹ It means all that is needed to enable us to do our

¹The word rendered "daily" in this fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer is a noticeable one. It has arrested the attention of numerous expositors, and received from them various explanations. As satisfactory, perhaps, as any of these explanations is that of the Rev. David Brown, D.D.: "The compound word here rendered 'daily' occurs nowhere else, either in classical or sacred Greek, and so must be interpreted by the analogy of its component parts. But on this critics are divided. . . . The great majority of the best critics understand by it the 'staff of life,' 'the bread of subsistence'; and so the sense will be, 'Give us this day the

daily work, and meet and discharge our daily responsibilities. So with the reward of the laborer. It is to be sufficient to enable him to meet the obligations of the station to which his employment assigns him. In the current phrase of the day, it is to be "a living wage."

From these two commissions, then, emerge three principles of universal and permanent application to the labor problem: (1) The laborer is always to render his employer efficient and beneficent service. Neither the extent nor the quality of his labor is to be determined by the extent of his remuneration. (2) Capital, in need of service, is derelict in duty if it fails to accept the service which labor proffers. 3. Having accepted service, it is to give the laborer a living wage. Any employer asking full-time labor should compensate with an adequate full-time maintenance.

2. The next utterance of Jesus which bears upon the industrial problem is the *parable of The Laborers in the Vineyard*. While the parable, as spoken, had no reference to problems of economics; yet it furnishes some very pertinent suggestions as to their solution. It does so for two reasons: First, because it reveals much with regard to industrial methods at the time at which it was spoken; and, secondly, because these methods are indorsed and made analogues of those which are to prevail in the kingdom of heaven—that

bread which this day's necessities require'" (Com. at Matt. vi. 11). Owen comments as follows: "No other wants are referred to, save those of the day on which the prayer is offered. We are thus taught our daily dependence. This petition is as necessary and appropriate for the wealthy as the poor. All are indebted to Him, for the supply of their daily wants. *Our daily bread*. The word translated *daily*, might be more properly rendered, *substantial, necessary, that which is just enough, or required* for our subsistence. The word is found only here, and seems to have been coined for the occasion" (Com. *in loco*).

condition of affairs, yet to be realized in this world, when the will of God will be done in earth as it is done in heaven. Several things which lie patently on the surface need only be merely mentioned: (1) There is recognition of the permanency of the two essential factors of the industrial world — employers and laborers; or, to use the more common parlance of the day, capital and labor; (2) recognition of a labor market; (3) freedom of contract on the part of both capital and labor; (4) a recognized standard of compensation for service; (5) recognition of both full- and part-time hiring; (6) recognition of fixed time for payment of labor.

It is in connection with the payment of labor that the chief significance of the parable, in its economic as well as in its religious application, is found. When even was come, the Lord of the vineyard directed his steward to call the laborers together and give them their hire. He instructed him also to begin with those last hired; and to give to each of them a denarius. The manifest object of the Lord was to give to the first hired laborers opportunity to find fault with his course, and to give himself opportunity to justify it. The purpose of the Lord was realized. Those first hired did complain. Apparently they acted through a spokesman; for the reply of the Lord was addressed to an individual, and not to a group. Apparently, too, these were the only ones to complain. This was natural; as they had manifestly the best apparent reason for complaint. If they failed to secure a change in the award, it would manifestly be useless for the others to try. If they succeeded, the others would naturally be accorded similar treatment. It is worthy of note that it is the Lord himself who responds to the complaint of the laborers. He was willing to leave the administration of affairs to a subordinate; but not the statement of the principles upon

which the business is to be conducted, and their justification. These things he reserved for himself. And without hesitation or apology he does justify his conduct. Courteously addressing the spokesman of the first hired laborers, he says: "Friend, I do thee no wrong; didst not thou agree with me for a denarius?" Careful attention to the parable discloses the fact that the laborers, regarded as to compensation promised, were of three classes: (1) Those first hired were definitely promised a denarius a day. (2) Those employed at the third, sixth, and ninth hours were simply promised "whatsoever is right." (3) Those employed at the eleventh hour, according to the best reading, were not promised any compensation; and the latter part of the parable sustains this reading. It is noticeable that both in the Authorized and Revised versions the words "were hired," applied to the eleventh-hour laborers as they came forward to receive their pay, are in italics, indicating that there are no corresponding words in the original. The rendering of the American Bible Union is better: "They of the eleventh hour." The first had definitely agreed for a denarius. That they had received; and hence they had no claim upon the Lord. "Take that which is thine; and go thy way."

But the Lord does not stop with this negative defense of his conduct. He goes further, and positively justifies it. "It is my will to give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" This reply is a suggestive one. There is no attempt to justify the payment on the basis of service rendered. There is no hint that the labor of these last was superior in character or equal in amount to that of the first hired workmen. The payment was made simply because it was the Lord's pleasure to make it. And neither

the lawfulness nor the beneficence of that determination could be disputed.

There are here lessons for Socialism as well as Industrialism. Property is not robbery, as Proudhon has asserted. There is a right of property, and of individual control of it. But, confining attention to the industrial question, we note: (1) A laborer has no ground of complaint against an employer if the latter faithfully fulfills the contract on which the workman entered his service. (2) An employer may, at his discretion, give any laborer, or any class, or group, of laborers compensation greater than the standard wages. (3) Having done so, he is under no obligation to correspondingly increase the wages of all, or any, others in his employ.

THE MINISTRY OF THE APOSTLES.

For further development of Christian teaching respecting the industrial problem, we turn to the Epistles of Paul. To the Apostle to the Gentiles, chiefly, though not exclusively, was committed the task of developing the teaching of the Master not only in respect to theology and soteriology; but, as well, in reference to civics, ethics, and economics, in so far as these subjects were embraced in the Master's teaching. In his Epistles are several passages that relate to masters and servants. It will conduce to clearness to consider his teaching respecting these two classes separately.

1. And, first, his *teaching respecting servants*. Perhaps the most suggestive and comprehensive of his utterances with regard to these is found in his Epistle to the Colossians. The passage reads thus: "Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord; whatsoever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord, and not

unto men; knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance; ye serve the Lord Christ. For he that doeth wrong shall receive again for the wrong he hath done; and there is no respect of persons" (Col. iii. 22-25). Let it suffice simply to note the points he makes, without enlarging upon them: (1) Employees are to be obedient to their employers. They are to do what these want to be done; and to do it in the way these want it to be done. (2) They are to render faithful, conscientious service even in the absence of an overseer watching them. (3) They are to lift their conception of service above that of merely working for men, and to realize that they are serving Christ; and by him will be rewarded. (4) They are not to feel that, because they are simply employees, they can indulge in conduct which would be wrong in others. "There is no respect of persons."

2. Turning now to his *teaching regarding masters*, we have, in a passage immediately following the one just considered, perhaps his most suggestive utterance on the subject. His words are these: "Masters, render unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven" (Col. iv. 1). Two things are here required of masters respecting their servants. The first is that they are to give them what is just. In the light of what has been said, this may be understood to be a living wage. But that is not all. In the second place, they are to give them that which is equal. This is a most significant expression; and one of far-reaching application. A laborer is entitled to more than what, according to current standards, is a living wage. He must be given equality. The word is not an adjective but a noun. The margin of the Revision says: "Gr. equality." The word occurs but twice elsewhere

in the New Testament; and these two occurrences, fortunately, are in another epistle of this same Apostle. The words are found in 2 Cor. viii. 13-15: "For I say not this, that others may be eased, and ye distressed; but by equality; your abundance being a supply at this present time for their want, that their abundance also may become a supply for your want; that there may be equality; as it is written, He that gathered much had nothing over; and he that gathered little had no lack." This means that profits and wages are to be evened up — so evened up that there shall be equality between capital and labor.

The simple truth is that capital and labor belong to that great system of dualism that is characteristic of the universe. There is duality everywhere. We have day and night — summer and winter — cold and heat. The poise of the universe is preserved by the action and interaction of the great centrifugal and centripetal forces. Man is dual. He is male and female — body and soul; and his life is maintained by the alternate contraction and dilatation of his heart. There is duality in science. We have analytical and synthetical chemistry — inductive and deductive philosophy — objective and subjective theology. There is duality in the arts. The carpenter has his mortise and tenon. The plumber and the fireman have their pipe and hose with their male and female ends; and when two male ends are to be joined with a union coupler one end of that coupler has a right-hand thread and the other end has a left-hand thread. The principle is universal. And where it prevails, both factors are essential to the resultant product. And where both are essential we do not ask which is the more important and the more deserving of honor. We dare not; for there are no grades of importance in things that are essential. It is so with capital and

labor. Capital is inefficient without labor. Labor is helpless without capital. Both are equally essential to the manufacture of products. And if equal in producing products they should be equal in sharing profits. Masters must then devise some way by which equality between capital and labor can be secured. How is this to be done? The most obvious answer is, By some system of profit-sharing. Workmen employed in prosperous industries which are bringing wealth to their proprietors are not satisfied with generous wages, supplemented from time to time by special gifts. They dislike to receive as a gratuity that which they feel should come to them in equity. Hence the most obvious means of securing harmony between capital and labor, in such industries, is to give to labor an interest in the business. And such a solution seems to be suggested by the teaching of Jesus. In a parable recorded by John are these words: "He that is a hireling, and not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, beholdeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth, and the wolf snatcheth them, and scattereth them: he fleeth because he is a hireling, and careth not for the sheep" (John x. 12-13).

In other words, in time of stress, loyalty to an industry on the part of the employees is assured only when those employees are sharers in the business. Nor is this method of solution utterly impracticable. Who are the "captains of industry" to-day? Are they men who began their career as capitalists; or have they come up from, and out of, the ranks of labor? The general facts are known of all men. In this village are two great industries. Not a man in the local management of either of them began as a capitalist. In the larger of the two industries, one of the dominant partners in the firm and the general manager of the entire plant, less

than thirty years ago was simply an employee. The business failed. He was first put in charge — then admitted to partnership: and the business has prospered ever since: and is steadily and rapidly increasing. Facts being what they are, it must be conceded that, in industries of this character, some kind of partnership between capital and labor is altogether practicable.

And yet obvious, and apparently satisfactory, as is this method of harmonizing capital and labor in industries of this character, it becomes perfectly manifest, on a little reflection, that this is not the final solution of the industrial problem — that it does not embrace all that was intended by the Apostle when he exhorted masters to give to their servants that which is just and equal.

In the first place, it is only to a minority of those who secure maintenance through service that the solution can be applied. The labor of the great majority of employees does not crystallize into merchantable commodities: and hence that which is their due cannot be determined by a cost and profit account. In the second place, this solution looks only to the financial relations existing between masters and servants. It takes no account of the personal relationship. It contemplates laborers merely as machines for the production of profitable products. It takes no account whatever of them as men. We must, then, look more closely into the teaching of the Apostle if we are really to get his solution of the industrial problem.

The simple truth is, that, economically regarded, all men are either capitalists or laborers. That is, they all secure their maintenance either from income from their investments or from income from their service. And no solution of the labor problem will be, or can be, final that does not recognize

this fact. The problem is far broader than the mere adjustment of a wage scale between organized labor and organized capital. It must harmonize all employers and all employees. Those employers may be personal or collective, individual or corporate; and those employees may render physical, intellectual, or spiritual — industrial or professional — service. It matters not. The final solution of the industrial problem will harmonize all possible classes of employers and employees. It will harmonize wealth and work. If we turn to the writings of the Apostle with this thought in mind, we shall find that his method of solving the problem is to exhort separately the two classes of persons who constitute the two factors of the problem.

First, he exhorts servants as follows: "Wast thou called being a bondservant? care not for it; nay, even if thou canst become free, use it rather. For he that was called in the Lord, being a bondservant, is the Lord's freedman: likewise he that was called, being free, is Christ's bondservant. Ye were bought with a price; become not bondservants of men. Brethren, let each man, wherein he was called, therein abide with God" (1 Cor. vii. 20-24).¹ "Servants, be obedient unto

¹The true interpretation of this passage is extremely doubtful. It will be noticed, however, that the use made of the passage in this discussion does not depend on the interpretation which may be adopted. It is legitimate whichever of the two interpretations is accepted. I give a part of Stanley's comment as quoted in Lange's Commentary, *in loco*: "The question here is, . . . whether the sense is, 'Take advantage of the offer of freedom;' or, 'Remain in slavery, though the offer is made.' It is one of the most evenly balanced questions in the interpretation of the New Testament. . . The commentators before the Reformation have chiefly been in favor of the second; since, in favor of the first; but Chrysostom observes that, in his time, there were some who adopted the view favorable to liberty; as there have been some Protestant divines (e.g., Luther) who have adopted the view favorable to slavery. On the whole, the probability seems slightly to incline to the second; and the whole passage is then

them that according to the flesh are your masters, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not in the way of eyeservice, as men-pleasers; but as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as unto the Lord, and not unto men: knowing that whatsoever good thing each one doeth, the same shall he receive again from the Lord, whether he be bond or free" (Eph. vi. 5-8). "Let as many as are servants under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honor, that the name of God and the doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren; but let them serve them the rather, because they that partake of the benefit are believing and beloved. These things teach and exhort" (1 Tim. vi. 1-2). See also Col. iii. 22-25; Tit. ii. 9; compare also 1 Pet. ii. 18-20. These passages are so clear and specific that little needs to be said respecting them; yet it may be well to note briefly some points specially pertinent to the present discussion: (1) These passages all assume the permanent existence of masters and servants. The expectation that the time will ever come when all men will be so equal that no one will be a servant but all will be masters, is a Utopian dream. While the world stands, these two classes will exist side by

expressive of comfort to the slave under his hard lot, with which the Apostle sympathizes, and which he tenderly alleviates (as in Philem. 16, 17), though not wishing him to leave it. And if, as is possible, the prospect of liberty, to which the Apostle alludes, arose from the fact of the master being a Christian, this sense of the passage would be still further illustrated and confirmed by 1 Tim. 6:2; 'Let not (the slaves) that have believing masters despise them, because they are brethren, but rather serve them.' Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Hammond, Hodge, Barnes, and most English commentators, declare decidedly for the first view; but the best modern German Exegetes, de Wette, Meyer and others, follow the early Greek Fathers in adopting the second."

side. (2) A Christian is not to deem it a hardship if he finds himself in the servant or employee class. He is to remember that, though industrially he is a servant, spiritually he is a freeman—a freeman in the Lord. (3) Under all circumstances he is to maintain the rights of that freedom. He is not to become bondservant to men. He is bondservant only to Christ. He is then always to maintain his Christian character and discharge his Christian duties, whatever may be the character of his industrial superior. (4) He is to show due respect to his industrial superior, whatever his religious character. "The slaves who were under heathen masters were *positively* to regard their masters as deserving of honor, the slaves under Christian masters were, *negatively*, not to evince any want of respect. The former were not to regard their masters as their inferiors, and to be insubordinate, the latter were not to think them their equals, and to be disrespectful."¹ In any case they are to render the obedience due their masters because of their industrial position. (5) While they may accept opportunity which proffers to raise them up from the rank of servants and to place them in that of masters, they are not to seek such opportunity—much less are they to demand such advancement. (6) These things are to be not simply academically taught—they are to be pastorally applied.

Secondly, he exhorts masters as follows: "And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, and forbear threatening; knowing that he who is both their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no respect of persons with him" (Eph. vi. 9). "I beseech thee for . . . Onesimus: that thou shouldst have him forever; no longer as a servant, but more than a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much

¹ Ellcott.

rather to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord" (Philem. 10-16). See also Col. iv. 1, and compare James v. 4. With regard to these passages, note these things: (1) Masters and servants have reciprocal duties. It is especially noteworthy that the Apostle says that, *mutalis mutandis*; the same things are to be urged upon masters that were urged upon servants. (2) Masters are to realize that while they are masters to their servants, both themselves and their servants are servants to one Lord and Christ; and that with him there is no respect of persons. Both masters and servants are to realize that these distinctions of employers and employees — bosses and men — are functional and not personal¹ — dispensational and not eternal. They do not exist in Christian fellowship: "Where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. iii. 11). In a word, servants are to manifest and cultivate the characteristics of Christian manhood; and masters are to recognize and discharge the duties of Christian brotherhood.

In the light of the preceding discussion, authoritative Christian teaching respecting the labor question may be briefly summarized as follows:—

1. Christianity has no articulated system with which to displace the present industrial systems of the world. The words of the Master are spirit and life (John vi. 3). They do not reveal rules to be enforced, but ideals to be realized; and when these ideals are realized, old things will have passed away and all things will have become new.

¹ See 1 Cor. xii. 12-30. The Apostle is treating of the mystical body of Christ—the church. But his principle is equally applicable to the "body politic"—the state, and to the economic body—organized industry, as well as all other human organizations.

2. Servants are to be obedient to their masters, and always render them efficient and conscientious service.

3. Masters are to give their servants a living wage — a wage corresponding to the work to be done, the position to be occupied, the benefits to accrue from the service — and personal treatment according to personal worth.

If this be the teaching of Christianity, if it brings no definite system to be installed, but simply presents ideals to be realized, the practical question arises, What can be done — what should be done — to realize these ideals? Three things: (1) Labor should be led to realize that violence and crime — riot and bloodshed — is not the way to advance its interests, and secure the granting of its claims. (2) Labor is to be induced to render itself worthy, industrially and personally, of the rewards it seeks from capital. (3) Capital is to be induced to grant to labor its rightful claims: (*a*) Employment. (*b*) A “living wage” — a wage proportionate to the cost of maintenance, to the work to be done, the position to be maintained, the benefits to be derived from the service. (*c*) Personal treatment according to personal character.

“Worth makes the man, the want of it the fellow;
The rest is all but leather and prunella.”

But, after all, the question returns, How are these two factors of the problem to be reached, and made responsive to these ideals? By bringing to bear upon them the power of an enlightened and aroused public opinion. “These things teach and exhort” (1 Tim. vi. 2). “Masters, render unto your servants that which is just and equal” (Rev. Ver. margin, Gr. equality). (Col. iv. 1.) This may seem to be a hopeless method, but it is not. It is the Christian method, and it is an effective one. Masters were not all in Paul’s day rendering to their servants that which is just and equal; but he

gave no encouragement to a slave insurrection. Even then it was appeal to the master. There is almost irresistible influence in enlightened and aroused public opinion. Nehemiah realized this when he brought the oppressors of his people to righteousness by setting a great assembly against them (Neh. v. 7). He pressed upon their consciences the demands of the law whose authority they acknowledged, opened their hearts to the sufferings of their brethren which they witnessed, and stimulated their benevolence by holding before them the noble acts of beneficence performed by some of their brethren. Essentially the same was the course taken by President Roosevelt in the great anthracite coal strike of 1902; and he was successful for substantially the same reasons. In an address in New York City last spring, Governor Dix declared: "Public opinion is by far the greatest force in a democracy." And in a series of autobiographical articles, contributed a few years since to one of the popular magazines, Carl Schurz made this statement: "I have had an active part in a great many political campaigns and probably addressed as many popular meetings as any man now alive; and I have always found that whenever any public question under public discussion had in it a moral element, an appeal to the moral sense of the people proved uniformly the most powerful argument."¹ Let then, Pulpit and Press, School and Lyceum, Bench and Bar — every one in fact who has the ear of a fellow-man, contribute to the forming of such a public sentiment. With that secured, the work will have been more than half done. A determination to right the wrong in present industrial conditions will have been created; and, that having been done, the way to accomplish the task will soon appear. "Where there's a will there's a

¹McClure's Magazine, September, 1908.

way." Already there are encouraging indications that public sentiment is turning to the solution of the industrial problem by the application of the principles above indicated.

"Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that;
That sense and worth, o'er a' the earth,
May bear the gree, and a' that.
For a' that, and a' that,
It's coming yet, for a' that,
That man to man, the warld o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that."

ROBERT BURNS.

ARTICLE VII.

THE HISTORY OF THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AND
ITS NEWER REPRESENTATION.¹

BY EDUARD FRIEDRICH KÖNIG, M.D., BONN, GERMANY.

1. It is an open secret that the newer interpreters of the history of the religion of Israel who join the Wellhausen side base their views essentially upon the work of Wilhelm Vatke. The chief representative of this school says so himself; for he says at the end of the preface of his "*Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*" (2d ed., p. 14): "My conclusions are very nearly like those of Vatke, of whom I confess to have learned the most and best." With this he refers to Vatke's first main work, called "*Biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*." But this work was written by Vatke on the basis of Hegel's philosophy. This he admits just as readily as did his friend David Friedrich Strauss, who issued his "*Leben Jesu*" in the same year. Vatke even emphasizes his Hegelian standpoint in not a few places. For instance, he writes on page 591: "The historical course of the religion of the Old Testament comes to light as the outcome of the whole movement. If the tradition of the Hebrews gave the real course of the history of this people and its religion, we should find ourselves face to face with an enigma to which we can find absolutely no analogy; we should have the culmination at the beginning."

There is, however, an unscientific exaggeration in these

[¹ Copyrighted, 1912, by Bibliotheca Sacra Company.]

words; for, even if the historical tradition of the Israelites is taken, as it appears after critical research, it will by no means say that the culmination of the historical course was at the beginning. For this historical tradition also recognizes a development of the religious conceptions of Israel; for instance, in regard to the names of God and his attributes, and in regard to the legislation and the prophecies.

But should the historical tradition of Israel really show the culmination at the beginning, we would have to say, in the second place, that the historian ought to acknowledge this. For, refusing to do so, Vatke proved that he did not know the real method of historical research. He did not try to find the history in its sources, but to evolve it out of philosophical discussions. Like his teacher Hegel, Vatke conceived all history, especially the history of religion, under the point of view of constant evolution; and, according to this, his view had to rise from thesis to antithesis, and by suppression of these contraries to a new stage. So Vatke's view of the course of history was, by principle, evolutionary. Wellhausen, then, has learned "the most and the best" from a man who knew beforehand, according to his philosophical ideas, the rhythm of the course of history.

2. But perhaps this fundamental view inherited from Vatke, that all history, and especially the history of the religion of the Old Testament, showed the process of evolution, or inner development, out of a primitive germ, does not predominate any longer in the new works of the representatives of the Wellhausen school? This, however, is a vain hope, as we see when looking through these works with this object in view; for here we find, for instance, the following traces of evolutionary views.

Through the newer representations of Israel's history of

religion (as, for instance, in "Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments," by B. Stade, of which the first volume appeared in 1905) there runs, in the first place, like a red thread, the fundamental idea that a causal relation must have existed between the local surroundings of the Israelites and the growth of their political strength, on the one side, and the origin and development of their religion, on the other. For this cause these interpreters of the history of the religion of Israel make a pretended Beduin-ideal the father of the Old Testament religion, let the God of Israel "grow in the fight with the Canaanite gods,"¹ and make David, "also, a founder of religion," because, by the establishment of his kingdom, Jahve is said to have been made a god of the people instead of a primitive deity. Moreover, one finds in these representations a tendency to start from the "primitive" peoples, and their supposed extremely low ideas about God are taken as the standard of the original form of the true religion of Israel.² With Stade, the comparison of "specially primitive religions" serves to establish what were the religious thoughts of the patriarchs. Measured in this way, the patriarchs are supposed to have been the adherents of Fetichism and Demonology. Especially is fetichism attributed to the patriarchs by Wellhausen;³ and this statement is also defended by Kautzsch in his "Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments" (1911), which had already been published in

¹So Wellhausen in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, vol. 1. pt. 4 (1906), p. 14.

²Proofs for this from Stade can be found in my *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion kritisch dargestellt* (1912, bei Bertelsmann in Gütersloh), p. 25.

³Proofs for this from Stade, sect. 15, and others can be found in my *Geschichte der alttest. Religion*, p. 76.

1904 in England,¹ and therefore could be criticized in about seventy places in my volume.

3. But some might say, Though it cannot be disputed that Wellhausen's ideas in the representation of the history of the religion of Israel had started from Hegel's fundamental views, and have not been entirely severed from them, yet, for all this, the construction of the history as found in the works of the Wellhausen school need not have been influenced by this theory, and the representation of the course of Israel's history of religion which is found in the works of the Wellhausen school may, nevertheless, be perfectly correct. But is this really the case? To settle this question was the task which fell to the scientific students of the Old Testament, in opposition to these representations of Israel's history of religion, especially as they have been put before us since 1880, when Stade began to publish his "*Geschichte des Volkes Israel.*" Have now these representatives of the Old Testament researches changed their ground? By no means. The course of their contentions has, in its chief features, been as follows:

a. They first set out with the statement that the prophets of the eighth century had appeared as new creators, and had really produced the true Israelitish religion. So, then, the relation of these prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and so on to Moses, was the chief question which has come up for examination over and over again since 1880. Hence in my preliminary publication "*Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte*" (1884); in the work of James Robertson, "*The Early Religion of Israel*" (1885, later edited in German by von Orelli); of Kittel in his "*Geschichte der Hebräer*" (1888 and 1892); of Oettli, in "*Der Kultus bei Amos und Hosea*" (1895); of Sellin, in "*Beiträge zur israel-*

¹ In Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible, Extra Volume (1904), pp. 612-734.

itischen und jüdischen Religionsgeschichte," vol. i. (1896) pp. 34-39, etc.; of Giesebrecht, in "Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes" (1901), — in all these works, it was confirmed over and over again that the prophets of the eighth century were, according to their own testimony, primarily only *reformers*, if one may express it in a single word. They had the message of bidding their contemporaries to turn back to the religion as founded in Israel's youth (Hos. xi. 1), and to protest against all moral and religious deviations in which smaller or larger circles in Israel had denied that old idea. That these prophets had, in the second place, to complete the law, and so to deepen it, to develop more fully and to spiritualize the prophecy, has not been overlooked in these historical researches.

In consequence of these demonstrations, constantly growing more complete, the representatives of the Wellhausen side began later to acknowledge the extravagances of earlier sayings about the position of the prophets of the eighth century in the Old Testament history of religion. For Stade owns in his "Alttestamentlichen Theologie" (vol. i., 1905), § 105, that there was "a grain of truth in the common [!] conception which made the prophets of the eighth century appeal to the works of Moses." Lastly, a scholar who had taken Wellhausen's side in an extreme way upon a capital point¹ (the Messianic prophecy) opposed the adherents of that side in a decided manner on behalf of the religio-historical position of Moses. This, P. Volz did in his book "Mose: Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung über die Ursprünge der israelitischen Religion" (1907). Therefore one may say that a first chapter in the newer discussion about the course of the history of Israel's religion was concluded in the year 1907, although

¹ P. Volz, *Die vorexilische Jahveprophetie und der Messias* (1897).

much had to be straightened out yet in relation to the position of the prophets of the eighth century in the Old Testament History of Religion.¹

b. When this fundamental question was decided in its essentials, historic research had to begin a new chapter. The question had to be decided, whether the beginning of the true religion of Israel did not reach also *back of the time of Moses*. Hence it had to be determined whether the *patriarchs* really possessed only the common Semitic religion, as is maintained by the representatives of the Wellhausen school. It had to be determined whether the patriarchs really stood only on the basis of Polydemonism, of animal worship, ancestor worship and fetichism, worshipping holy mountains, waters, trees and stones as the habitations of godlike beings; for fetichism is ascribed to the patriarchs not only by Stade and Marti, but also by Kautzsch. As, on this view, the patriarchs are placed on a level with other Semites and primitive peoples, it seems to be an unhistorical statement, since Abraham separated himself even from his parents precisely *because* of his religion. Hence it is necessary to examine the modern dogma, according to which no "patriarchal religion" could be reckoned as the true religion of Israel of the first grade. This was a second principal reason why I have now edited the already mentioned "Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion." In it I hope to have proved, by critical examination of all the newer statements about the religious conditions in the time of the patriarchs, that the Bible is absolutely correct in calling their religion the first degree of the true religion of Israel.

c. Alongside of this chief debate ran many others. For,

¹ Compare my *Geschichte*, etc., pp. 343-350, where everything has been criticized, even what was called new or unheard-of in Wellhausen's newest work about the prophets of the eighth century.

during the last twenty to thirty years, the whole construction of the history of Israel's religion as built up by the Wellhausen school has been examined in its basis and all its phases by many learned critics, and the voice of these¹ can be heard once more in my book. In these researches about the Wellhausen history of Israel's religion, answer has been given, for instance, to the following questions: Was the name of the God who revealed himself to Moses borrowed from the Midianites to whom Moses fled?² Was the Godhead announced by Moses "a local god"? Was this god looked upon as a god of thunderstorms, — a Vulcan who was governed by the consciousness of his might, and demanded to be worshiped by human sacrifice? Did the "desert religion" of the Mosaic Israel turn into a "rustic religion" after its immigration into Canaan? Was the religious perception of Israel "enriched" by the myths and legends of Babylon? Was the Ark in the holy of holies regarded as a representation of Jahve? Did the name of God, Jahve Sebaoth, which is introduced in 1 Sam. i. 3, mean the god of the "mythological powers" (lightning, rain), as the auxiliaries of the god of thunderstorms?³ Was the old prophetic religion deepened by Solomon's commercial treaties and other cosmopolitan relations? May the time before Amos be called "anteprophetic" time?

These and at least a dozen other important questions which have been raised mostly by the Wellhausen representation of the religious history of Israel have been critically examined, with these two questions in view, by competent Old Testa-

¹The learned men of English tongue as well have been considered and quoted often by me.

²The so-called Kenite Hypothesis. The name of Jahve is discussed in my book on pp. 162-169.

³So Marti, *Geschichte der Israel. Religion* (1907), p. 158.

ment critics, who *do* actually exist outside the Wellhausen school and in spite of it. But in all these researches it could be proved¹ that the Wellhausen construction of the religious history of Israel is disproved in all its essential parts by the unqualified assertions of the Hebrew books of history. For this construction often did not start with the testimonies of historical sources, while these have often been severed from their original position and the accepted principle has mostly been forgotten that the *common* consent of the different sources has to be regarded as of the greatest importance. By avoiding these and other mistakes, it can be proved, in the first place, by positive assertions of the sources, that the patriarchs really existed, and that their religion was a power which could not have been derived from the historical circumstances of their time. Moreover, the true development of the Old Testament religion is indicated, while many changes which were adopted later in the "history, etc.," had to be pronounced artificial products of an evolutionary assumption.

4. Does, then, scientific progress lie in the accentuation of the Wellhausen suppositions about the course of the religious history of Israel? Do matters stand as represented in an address recently delivered (Nov. 1911) in Berne by Karl Marti about "Stand und Aufgabe der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft in der Gegenwart"? In this he adheres to the statements, repeated over and over again in recent publications, of the Wellhausen school of Old Testament criticism, and honors these as the work of "Old Testament science." Only books which share these fundamental views are said to be works which "show the progress of science," but no researches are mentioned in which the justification of Wellhausenian assumptions have been challenged. Vainly one

¹ For details I must ask the readers to refer to my *Geschichte*.

looks (to say nothing of my "*Hauptprobleme*," 1884), for works like that of James Robertson, or any of the above-mentioned books of Kittel, etc. Nor is the important work of M. J. Lagrange¹ even mentioned.

Such proceedings cannot be called presentation of facts; for, if any one undertakes to give the picture of the "state of the science of Old Testament criticism at the present time," he must needs tell what problems in the science of Old Testament religion are uppermost in our day, and what special attempts are made nowadays to solve them. But if the speaker thinks it right to proclaim as the "state of Old Testament science" what he personally thinks to be right, he forces the other workers on the subject to speak up in order to complete the picture of the present state of the Old Testament science sketched by him. To do this was my duty, being one of the older representatives of Old Testament science, and having always made researches into the religion of the Old Testament my most important study. For the future I trust in this matter, as in others, to an unprejudiced use of the critically examined sources and an impartial consideration of the writings of all co-workers. This only will bring correct results.

¹ *Etudes sur les religions sémitiques* (2d ed. 1905).

ARTICLE VIII.

CRITICAL NOTE.

**PAUL'S TRANSFORMATION IN CHARACTER: A WITNESS
TO THE POWER OF DIVINE GRACE.**

THE fame of Paul in Christian history rests chiefly upon the twin pillars of his missionary labors and his interpretation of the person and work of Christ. Along each of these lines his influence upon succeeding Christianity has been of the most vital sort conceivable; so that the church of to-day, whether in its world-conquest or in its most generally accepted view of Christ, can hardly be imagined apart from what he did and thought. And yet, great as are these aspects of Paul's service to Christianity, it is at least possible that his personal character is an even more valuable asset to Christ's cause to-day, because of its incontestable witness to the power of Divine Grace to change utterly a human life.

On any conception of the exact mode and manner of his conversion, a spiritual chasm yawns between the pre-Christian and the Christian Paul. Readers of Mr. Harold Begbie's "Twice-born Men," with its straightforward, convincing portrayal of the marvelous transformation in character wrought recently in some of the men of darkest London by the manifest power of God, will have the change in Paul most vividly suggested to their minds. It is of course true that these men were redeemed from unspeakable vice and degradation, which could not be said of the scrupulously moral, even ascetic Saul of Tarsus; but in cataclysmic suddenness of experience, in total and abiding change in the viewpoint and purpose of life, there is unmistakable identity. Furthermore, there is in Paul a transformation in personal character just as far-reaching as in the cases of these men, and scarcely less astonishing, all things considered.

This transformation is best seen on the side of his affec-

tions. His utter devotion henceforth to God as revealed in Christ needs no comment. It pervades his life like a delicate fragrance. Even more significant, however, of the change in him, is his new tenderness and sympathy for his fellow-men; and this deserves greater emphasis than it commonly receives. The wonder only grows, the more one considers the difference, here, between the Pharisee and the Christian.

1. It is but glimpses that are given of Saul of Tarsus before the journey to Damascus, but they are flash-light portraits of a dark and gloomy soul. He is first seen as a youth, studying the classics of his race in the great school of Gamaliel. Having adopted with that intensity which was his lifelong characteristic the narrow Pharisaic ideal of legal righteousness, it is his consuming ambition to work it out in his life as it has never been worked out before. It is said that Gamaliel himself was a broad-minded man, with sympathy for other viewpoints than his own; and certainly the speech attributed to him, recorded in the book of Acts (v. 34-39), bears out this claim. But Saul of Tarsus shows no slightest trace of such breadth. If Gamaliel's attitude was appreciated by him at all, it only provoked a more extreme reaction, as is proved by the next picture.

Here Saul is seen acting in violent opposition to Stephen, the man of vision. The latter's presentation, so inspiring and illuminating to-day, of God's dealings with Israel as a progression, reaching its climax in Jesus and a spiritual religion which should far transcend the limits of Jerusalem and its Temple, and embrace all nations in a great democracy of faith — this was blasphemy to Saul, the contradiction of everything he held dear, and he would stamp it out, even if it took false witness and stoning to do it. Here the thing to be noted is not the cruelty of putting Stephen to death, nor even the baseness of using false witnesses against him. It is far more the darkness of soul which could see no beauty or desirableness in the picture Stephen painted of God and of religion, could feel no response but hate to the heralding

in Jesus of a new and glorious day for every son of the Heavenly Father. Can this be the man who later wrote: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one in Christ Jesus"? (Gal. iii. 28).

A final glimpse of the pre-Christian Paul he himself supplies in his speech before Herod Agrippa II., as found in Acts xxvi. Here he tells (ver. 10-11) of his part in the general persecution of the church which followed upon Stephen's death,—how he put Christians into prison, voted to condemn them to death, and even tried to force them to revile Jesus and renounce their faith. He was pursuing them relentlessly, even to cities outside Jerusalem, and finally as far as Damascus. In it all the impression of his darkness of soul at this time is deepened. There is no slightest suggestion of sympathy for the unfortunate objects of his fury. He is as hard as adamant. The name of Jesus, which could not but call up to many, even of the orthodox, memories of a beautiful and beneficent life, has no appeal for him. Rather let him be reviled as the lowest of the low, and this pestilent sect be rooted out. The pre-Christian Saul, in short, stands forth about as forbidding a character, and as difficult to think of as loving and beloved, as one of Mr. Harold Begbie's hardened men.

2. And then, to him as to them, comes the cataclysmic change. A new man is born. No wonder the figure of a "new creature" (e.g. 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15) was a favorite with Paul. In himself he had such daily witness to the transforming power of Divine Grace as must have staggered, often, his belief in his own identity. He finds his soul, "cribbed, cabined, and confined" before, become a roomy, sunlit place. The once all but dried-up stream of his sympathies now sweeps on, a mighty river, eager to bless a world. "I am a debtor," he cries, this once self-centered, race-proud Pharisee, "both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish" (Rom. i. 14). Oh, the wonder of it!

Readers of Paul's writings will require no proof of the great-hearted love of this transfigured personality for even the least lovable, seemingly, of his fellow-men. How beautifully his deep affection lights up his very earliest letters! The Galatians, in their soul-peril, are his "little children," of whom in his more than father — yes, in his very mother-love, he is again in travail, until Christ be formed in them (Gal. iv. 19). To the Thessalonians he has been as a loving nurse to her helpless charge: he has imparted to them not only the gospel, but his very soul as well. When he must needs be parted from them, his heart remains behind, and his one prayer is to be able to come back. They are his "glory" and his "joy," his very "crown of glorying" (1 Thess. ii. 7, 8. 17-20). And what manner of people were these but lately — yes, even then? Such that Saul of Tarsus, in the old days, would have counted himself polluted had they but touched the hem of his sweeping robe; and that not only because they were Gentiles, but more because they were morally vile. Their condition may be realized through reading between the lines of Paul's earnest warnings to them (e.g. Gal. v. 19-21; 1 Thess. iv. 3-7); their new faith had not yet freed them entirely from the foulness of heathenism, out of which they had lately come. Saul the Pharisee, in the narrowness and hardness of his self-righteousness, would assuredly have loathed them, but Paul the Christian — oh, how he loves and pities them, even as his Saviour loved and pitied him, when he reached down from his throne in glory and arrested his persecuting fury on the Damascus road.

Is not this a transformation in character equal to that in any of Mr. Harold Begbie's men, and is it not a thing which dwarfs by comparison all Paul's other contributions to Christianity, apart from which they had been but the "sounding brass and clanging cymbal" of his own thought, had they indeed been possible at all? It would seem so; and it would appear, also, that in this present time, when the basis of Apologetic has come to be so largely spiritual, the Church

should rejoice more in, and rest more solidly upon, this her first great spiritual miracle — the transformation in character of Saul of Tarsus.

HOWELL M. HAYDN.

Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

HISTORY NOT EXPLAINED BY EVOLUTION.

[FROM ADVANCE SHEETS OF WRIGHT'S "ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF MAN."]

THERE is no invariable law of progress in human history. The various elements at work in society tend in all directions. As a matter of fact, degeneration and disintegration seem as likely to take place as real progress and advancement. Among the common people in Egypt there has been no progress for six thousand years, and the same is true respecting most ancient centers of civilization. . . . The civilization of Europe and America lighted its torch from the altars of the decaying civilizations of Greece and Rome, and they, in turn, lighted theirs from altars of Babylonian and Egyptian wisdom. But whence did Egypt and Babylonia derive the fire with which to kindle the flame upon their altars? This mystery is so great that we are forbidden to speak with derision of those who insist that the wisdom of Egypt was given by direct inspiration from heaven or was handed down from a prior original direct revelation. We prefer, however, to say that its mystery is that which surrounds all the great geniuses whose careers have swayed and blessed or cursed the world. A candid study of history will compel one more and more to recognize the dependence of the race upon a few great leaders in thought and action.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

ASPECTS OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND PRACTICE IN BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA. By MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Pennsylvania. 8vo. Pp. xxv, 471. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1911. \$2.25, *net*.

This latest issue in the series of "American Lectures on the History of Religions" is a worthy successor to the eight interesting and instructive volumes which have preceded it. Professor Jastrow's new book in some measure compensates the English reading public for their lack of an equivalent to the German edition of the author's notable work on "The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria." In brief but authoritative outline the latest word is given on the antiquity and development of the Babylonian-Assyrian civilization (chap. i.), and on the Babylonian "Pantheon" (chap. ii.). The larger part of the book is then devoted to the special subjects of "Divination," "Astrology," "The Temples and the Cults," and "Ethics and Life after Death" (chaps. iii.-vi.). Full chronological lists, a map, indices, and fifty-four carefully selected plates, mainly illustrative of the religious beliefs of the people, are valuable additions to the work. A few illustrations of the many points discussed in the book will serve to show its interest and its value.

With regard to the still debated question as to the existence of a Sumerian civilization prior to the Semitic, the great value of Halevy's work in pointing out Semitic elements in the so-called Sumerian language is cordially recognized. Nevertheless, Professor Jastrow allies himself with the great majority of scholars in holding to a distinct non-Semitic Sumerian people, and therefore to the existence of a Sumerian

language, traces of which it is proper to hunt for in inscriptions which come from the old Sumerian centers (pp. 6 ff.).

In discussing other foreign influences than the ancient Sumerian upon the Semitic civilization of Babylonia and Assyria, the Amurru theory of Professor Clay already begins to make itself felt (pp. 26, 76). Professor Jastrow is willing to admit a considerable amount of Western influence upon the Sumero-Akkadian civilization, though properly skeptical of the extent of that influence which Clay maintains.

The vast periods of time which, only a few years ago, were thought to be reclaimed for authenticated history, have been considerably reduced of late. Some thirteen hundred years have been deducted from Sargon of Agade, to whom chronologists had been accustomed to assign the date *ca.* 3800, on the basis of calculations by Nabonnedos, and the earliest historical period is now given, according to Professor Jastrow, as *ca.* 2800-2000 B.C.; while the date of Hammurabi is lowered to 1958-1816, or one hundred years later than the date assigned to him by Nabonnedos.

The exciting debate over the existence of a Babylonian astral monotheism is touched upon only lightly. It is maintained that a "monotheistic strain . . . is vaguely but unquestionably present in the speculations of the Babylonian-Assyrian priests" (p. 417). But this strain, seen in the thought that other gods are only manifestations of Marduk, is philosophic rather than religious, the possession of a few of the choicer minds and without practical consequences, and the difference between this Babylonian philosophic monotheistic tendency and the genuine religious monotheism of the Hebrew prophets is emphatically asserted (*ibid.*). The distinction between the two is brought out in the following interesting sentence: "The distinctive feature of Hebrew monotheism is its consistent adherence to the principle of a transcendent deity, and *of the reorganization of the cult in obedience to this principle. No attempt was made at any time in Babylonia and Assyria to set aside the cult of other gods in favor of Marduk*" (*italics mine*).

In general, the great ethical and religious superiority of the biblical traditions to the kindred material in Babylonia and Assyria is asserted. But this does not mean that there was not a very creditable basis of ethics in the Euphratean civilization. It is rightly said that "to judge fairly of the ethics of any people, we must take them at their best"; and in the very interesting treatment accorded to the penitential psalms and the Code of Hammurabi (or Hammurapi as Professor Jastrow prefers to spell the name), the genuine ethical element in this early civilization is revealed with great clearness. It is, to be sure, an ethic of this world. The thought of rewards and punishments in the life hereafter does not dominate it. But, for that matter, other-worldly considerations have little or nothing to do with the ethics of ancient Israel.

The chapter on "Astrology" and especially on "Divination" present a less pleasing side of Babylonian religion. The chapter on "Divination" is taken principally up with a discussion of liver-divination. But even here the old Babylonian and Assyrian practices contrast very favorably in their honesty with the charlatanry into which this form of reading the future had degenerated in Greek and Roman times. Incidentally the injunction to burn "the caul above the liver," so frequently found in the Pentateuchal codes, is explained as due to the hostility which the Hebrew lawgivers had to all forms of divination. This part of the liver is identified with the finger-shaped appendix which hangs from the upper lobe of the liver, and which played a prominent part in the Babylonian divination.

The Bible student will find many such examples of the way in which Professor Jastrow's book throws interesting sidelights upon the interpretation of the Old Testament. As a popular but authoritative introduction into the fascinating subject of which it treats, this work on the Religion of Babylonia deserves the widest circulation. A few misprints have been noted. On page 172 Leviticus iii. 4 should be read for Leviticus ii. 4.

KEMPER FULLERTON.

GEDANKEN ÜBER DIE ENTWICKLUNG DER RELIGION, AUF GRUND DER BABYLONISCHEN QUELLEN. By AAGE SCHMIDT. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1911.

This study, unlike the luminously written book of Professor Jastrow characterized above, is not a work which the layman would enjoy. It is full of technicalities, and assumes a large amount of knowledge on the part of the reader with the material commented upon. The thesis of the book is that a distinct development can be traced from the old Sumerian religious literature to the Babylonian. It is held that, in general, the Sumerian hymns and incantations are older than the Babylonian and present a higher form of religion. Anu and Bel of the Sumerian hymns, which are hardly more than two forms of one god, are increasingly displaced by the lesser gods of the Babylonian Pantheon. The old Sumerian hymns become in the later Babylonian forms hardly more than incantations, and their religious value is lessened; while the Sumerian incantations themselves show a progressive degeneration in their Babylonian forms, and become mere mechanical magical formulas. The same development is traced in the religious literatures of surrounding peoples, notably the Egyptians.

K. F.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. By the MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. Published in Commemoration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the Seminary. 8vo. Pp. viii, 634. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912. \$3.00, *net*.

The Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary have a preëminent advantage in their numbers. Fifteen names appear in the preparation of this volume. Naturally, where there are so many collaborators, there can be such division of labor that each writer is an authority in his department, and, as a consequence, we have a volume displaying scholarship of the highest order, furnishing a storehouse of richest material for the defense and statement of conservative views respecting the foundations of our Christian faith.

Following are the contents of the volume: "Theological Encyclopedia" (34 pp.), by Francis Landey Patton; "On the Emotional Life of our Lord" (56 pp.), by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield; "The Child whose Name is Wonderful" (18 pp.), by John D. Davis; "Jonathan Edwards: A Study" (28 pp.), by John De Witt; "The Supernatural" (72 pp.), by William Brenton Greene, Jr.; "The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit" (52 pp.), by Geerhardus Vos; "The Aramaic of Daniel" (46 pp.), by Robert Dick Wilson; "The Place of the Resurrection Appearances of Jesus" (50 pp.), by William Park Armstrong; "Modern Spiritual Movements" (36 pp.), by Charles Rosenbury Erdman; "Homiletics as a Theological Discipline" (30 pp.), by Frederick William Loetscher; "Sin and Grace in the Biblical Narratives Rehearsed in the Koran" (34 pp.), by James Oscar Boyd; "The Finality of the Christian Religion" (45 pp.), by Caspar Wistar Hodge, Jr.; "The Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas" (53 pp.), by Kerr Duncan Macmillan; "Jesus and Paul" (34 pp.), by John Gresham Machen; "The Transcendence of Jehovah, God of Israel" (56 pp.), by Oswald Thompson Allis.

The defense of the Messianic prophecies in Isaiah by Doctors Davis and Allis is specially timely; Dr. Allis's being peculiarly original, presenting an argument from the poetic rhythm of the prophecy. Dr. Greene's elaborate treatment of the Supernatural is based upon a stricter definition of the word than is generally prevalent. Rejecting Bushnell's definition, which calls everything supernatural which acts upon nature from without the chain of cause and effect, Dr. Greene identifies the Supernatural with the Infinite, the Absolute, and the Unconditioned, thus affirming the absence of every restriction. Professor Wilson's defense of the genuineness of the book of Daniel, from a study of its linguistic peculiarities, is an overwhelming answer to the argument for a late date presented by Dr. Driver. Dr. De Witt's study of Jonathan Edwards is most appreciative, bringing out, among other things, the great inconsistency of the critics who laud Dante's

"Inferno" and execrate Edwards for his sermon on "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." He declares that Edwards is rightly called "our greatest American divine. He was indeed inexpressibly great in his intellectual endowment, in his theological achievement, in his continuing influence. He was greatest in his attribute of regnant, permeating, irradiating spirituality" (p. 136).

THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN MODERN THOUGHT. The First Series of Donnellan Lectures for the Year 1911-1912. By E. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, M.A., Litt.D. 8vo. Pp. 419. London: James Clarke and Company; Boston: The Pilgrim Press. 1912. \$2.00.

In defending the scientific character of Reformed theology, the author of this able, comprehensive, and most instructive volume congratulates himself that he is in the company of such representative scholars as Theodor Zahn in Germany, Abraham Kuyper in Holland, B. B. Warfield in America, J. Orr in Scotland, and Bishop H. C. G. Moule and Dean Wace in the Anglican communion. It is well to keep in mind the fact that the views of Christ's person, character, and mission which have prevailed up to the present time have not been disproved by modern criticism, and are ably defended by an increasing number of modern scholars thoroughly equipped with all the learning of the times. This volume cannot but give a great stimulus to evangelical Christianity by the way in which it unfolds the conception of Christ which has ever been the mainspring of the church's activity.

After discussing at length the position advocated by a long list of negative critics of the past century, the author proceeds, in the last half of the volume, to unfold the witness borne to the personality of Christ by the claims of Christ himself, by the personal miracles connected with his earthly career, and by the apostolic witnesses, leading to the conclusion of the Nicene Creed, that Christ was "very God of very God"; yet the divine element in him was so united to a human element that he was, after all, but one person. Rejecting the various positions of the Kenotic Christology, the theories

of Progressive Incarnation, and that of Dr. Sanday representing the subconscious deity in Christ as "*donum superadditum*," our author presents the theory that there was "a continuous act of Self-limitation" on the part of the Eternal Word through a manhood which was impersonal. This limitation of the divine personality operating through the manhood of Jesus is compared to that of a slave who should refuse freedom and voluntarily choose the limitations of slavery. Christ as the Eternal Son must have the "power to limit or sacrifice Himself as He sees fit. The atoning work of Christ as revealing divine Self-sacrifice in the abnegation of the Divine prerogatives and glory is a vindication of the moral character of the Eternal and Ever-living God. It is in Divine Self-limitation that Divine omnipotence finds its highest expression" (p. 391).

The reader will find in this volume a candid consideration of all objections, a cautious presentation of theories concerning the mode of divine activities, and convincing defenses of the main points of the orthodox creeds in their presentation of the character and work of our Divine Lord and Redeemer.

THE HISTORICITY OF JESUS: A Criticism of the Contention that Jesus Never Lived, a Statement of the Evidence for his Existence, an Estimate of his Relation to Christianity. By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE, of the Department of New Testament Literature and Interpretation in the University of Chicago. 12mo. Pp. vii, 352. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1912. \$1.50, *net*.

The extent to which agnosticism has penetrated a certain portion of the scholarly world is shown in the fact that in this volume nearly three-fourths of the space is devoted to proving that such a person as Jesus actually existed. It would seem a great pity that so much of our time and thought has to be devoted to the defense of such a generally accepted proposition. But our author reassures us that the establishment of the Christian era did really begin in the life of a person who bore the title of Christ Jesus. The space devoted to Jesus as the historical Founder of Christianity and to the

significance of his life for modern religion is all too short, but is specially valuable for its literary references. While there is not much that is inspiring in this presentation, it will doubtless be helpful to many whose faith has been undermined by the reiterated dogmatic assertions of modern destructive but delusive and unscientific criticism.

AUTHORITY: The Function of Authority in Life, and Its Relation to Legalism in Ethics and Religion. By A. v. C. P. HUIZINGA, author of "Belief in a Personal God," "The American Philosophy Pragmatism," etc. 8vo. Pp. viii, 270. Boston: Sherman, French, and Company. \$2.25, *net*.

THE AUTHORITY OF MIGHT AND RIGHT. By A. v. C. P. HUIZINGA. 12mo. Pp. 40. Boston: Sherman, French, and Company. 50 cents, *net*.

Dr. Huizinga's able and learned volume on "Authority" deserves special attention because of its timeliness. Christianity, as our author truly says, has its ground in objective reality. "Christ is its cause and center. Christian theology will be cast adrift on the eddying tides of human opinion" unless this is recognized. It becomes, therefore, of the greatest importance that we reinstall in the minds of the present generation confidence in the historical character of the Bible. We know Christ only through the records of his life found in the New Testament.

In the smaller volume the author presents, in brilliant form, a defense of the proposition that right is might; and that, in reality, might is only the servant of right.

The writings of Dr. Huizinga are a wholesome protest against the vague subjectivity of much of the modern speculation upon the themes of which he treats.

LUTHERAN GERMANY AND THE BOOK OF CONCORD: A Treatise on Confessional Subscription. By JOHN O. EVJEN, Ph.D. (Leipzig), Professor of Church History in Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn. 8vo. Pp. 76. Minneapolis, Minn.; The Free Church Book Concern. 50 cents.

In this brief publication, Dr. Evjen, without pausing to

give a history of the "Book of Concord," contents himself with clearly indicating the position which it holds in each of the twenty-six states of Germany, and with showing how many of the distinctively Lutheran symbols contained in it are enforced, and to what extent they obligate the clergy. The work is of special interest to all Lutherans, who are divided upon the question of the extent to which subscription to this book is required. In Europe nearly 30,000,000 Lutherans do not accept the "Book of Concord"; while 16,000,000 do accept it. It would seem, therefore, according to our author, that a general Lutheran conference could not properly be called in America on the basis of the "Book of Concord."

MISCELLANIES. By AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG, D.D., LL.D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary; author of "Systematic Theology," "Outlines of Systematic Theology," "Philosophy and Religion," "The Great Poets and their Theology," "Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism." In Two Volumes. Vol. I. Chiefly Historical. Pp. xi, 493. Vol. II. Chiefly Essays and Seminary Anniversary Addresses. Pp. viii, 504. Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Toronto: The Griffith and Rowland Press. 1912. \$1.00, per volume.

The public will welcome these volumes as shedding sidelights upon, and further developing, the ideas of Dr. Strong as advocated in his systematic publications. The author has thought long and profoundly upon nearly every theme that engrosses the attention of the religious world at the present time. We have space but to note his significant remarks in concluding a very able paper upon "Degeneration." After giving with considerable fullness the evidence of jurists, naturalists, historians, philosophers, travelers, theologians, and anthropologists, that the true theory of evolution involves the degeneration of all forms that from any cause become unadapted to their conditions, our author remarks: "In the light of this evidence it seems to me still possible and rational

to believe that man was made in the image of God; that man's condition was that of an innocent child, but not that of a brutal savage; that he possessed a knowledge of God and of duty; that by transgression he fell into a lower moral state which involved him in degradation and misery; that growing knowledge of the arts, even in the most civilized, was accompanied by a growing moral blindness, until monotheism was replaced by pantheism, polytheism, or atheism. The Apostle Paul, in the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, has given us the key to history, when he declares that primitive man knew God, but glorified him not as God; that he exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and in consequence was given up to a reprobate mind; and that his degeneration can be counteracted only by regeneration from above" (vol. ii. p. 128).

"THE OLD LAMP." By Rev. THOMAS WHITELAW, M.A., D.D. Pp. ix, 268. London and New York: Marshall Brothers, Ltd. 1912. 6s.

In this work Dr. Whitelaw, who is well known, as an Old Testament critic, on both sides of the Atlantic, brings together, in popular and readable form, a number of short Studies on the Bible, which is, of course, "the Old Lamp." The value of the work is, that there is knowledge behind its popular presentation. But the knowledge is never obtruded, and though one may observe references to Buhl, Budde, Jeremias, Meinhold, Bousset, Schmiedel, Gunkel, König, Kautzsch, Wernle, and others, yet these are made in such a way as not to disturb the most ordinary reader. There are twelve chapters in the book, dealing with such topics as the age, structure, inspiration, universal appeal, use, power, and value of the Bible. In the treatment of these subjects, there are many references to show that, while desirous to conserve all that is best in what has been thought or written about the Bible, Dr. Whitelaw has had an alert mind, and been sensitive to the needs and influences of the age, to which, however, he does by no means lightly succumb. I do not think

Dr. Whitelaw loves the Bible less, and am certain he knows it better, than even the late Dr. Parker, who had not his exegetical learning. Dr. Whitelaw is the present Moderator of the great United Free Church of Scotland, and the book is a fitting sign and memorial of his Presbyterian archiepiscopate!

JAMES LINDSAY.

Irvine, Scotland.

THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Edited by SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D. Complete in Twelve Volumes. 8vo. Volume XII. TRENCH-ZWINGLI. Appendix. Pp. xxvi, 599. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls Company. Complete, \$60: per volume, \$5.00.

This volume concludes a work of gigantic proportions. The total number of pages in the series amount to 6342, treating of 8791 main, and 12,229 subsidiary topics. Eight hundred collaborators have been engaged upon the work, and the cost has been upwards of \$300,000. The feature of the encyclopedia which gives it a specially unique character is its attention to many current topics that are not treated in any other encyclopedia. For example, in this volume we have extended and valuable articles upon "Union of the Churches" (twenty-five columns), "Young Peoples' Societies" (twenty-eight columns), and "Universities" (twelve columns), while the biographies, especially of American scholars, receive an attention that is given nowhere else in encyclopedias of this character. Among the prominent subjects treated with fullness by American scholars are: "Turkey," by George Washburn; "Virgin Birth" and "Freedom of the Will," by C. A. Beckwith; "Wesley," by H. K. Carroll; "West Indies," by Theodora Crosby Bliss; "Westminster Assembly" and "Westminster Standards," by David S. Schaff; "Witchcraft" and "Zoroastrianism," by George W. Gilmore; "Women's Work in the Church," by Louise Seymour Houghton; while the Appendix has an article of considerable length upon

Vol. LXIX. No. 275. 11

"Lay Preaching," by H. Jeffs, and "Monophysitism," by Ernest C. Margrander, and "Oberlin Theology" is briefly but accurately characterized by Professor Beckwith.

In general, the tone of the volume is characterized by a wise conservatism, and the whole series will be an invaluable addition to any library.

THE CHINESE REVOLUTION. By ARTHUR JUDSON BROWN, author of "New Forces in Old China," "The New Era in the Philippines," "The Foreign Missionary," "The Why and How of Foreign Missions," and joint author of "The Nearer and Farther East." 12mo. Pp. x, 217. New York: Student Volunteer Movement. 1912. 75 cents, *net*.

A timely volume by a competent author upon a subject that for some time must engross the attention of the world. One must read it to appreciate the almost incredible changes that are proceeding so rapidly in the Chinese Empire. The mass of readers will be surprised at the extent to which it has already been leavened by the gospel.

DE NAAM GODS IN DEN PENTATEUCH. Eene studie naar aanleiding en tot toelichting van Ex. 6: 1 vv. Door Dr. A. TROELSTRA, Predikant bij de herv. gem. te 's-Gravenhage. Utrecht: G. J. A. Ruys. 1912.

This little volume is of exceptional interest for more than one reason. It contains the substance of lectures delivered at Leyden, and it bears definite testimony to the growing repugnance to the documentary theory which characterizes the Dutch theological thought of to-day. It makes a strong stand against the acceptance of Astruc's clue, and all that depends from it. One of the avowed objects of the book is to serve the interests not merely of theologians, but also of wider circles, and accordingly it is written in a clear, perspicuous, easy style, which makes its perusal a pleasure. Another declared purpose is to familiarize Dutch readers with results that were first published in England and America. In the upshot we have the most conservative and readable volume that has proceeded from any Protestant university of

Continental Europe for many a long year. It is not altogether a coincidence that this volume has arisen out of lectures delivered at Kuenen's old university, and as one ponders the change the immense significance of the turn in the current of opinion in Holland becomes ever clearer. The religious spirit which pervades the book is not its least important characteristic. To-day it is possible to get instruction at Leyden which is not colored with rationalistic bias.

Troelstra begins his monograph by explaining how Astruc sought to divide Genesis by means of his famous clue, the use of the Tetragrammaton and *Elohim*, and he at once draws attention to certain preliminary objections to the theory,—the fact that, on the hypothesis, Exodus vi. 3 should point to narratives using *El Shaddai* (Eng. Ver., "God Almighty"), not *Elohim*, and the occurrence of *Elohim* in J and the Tetragrammaton in P. He proceeds to deal with the redactors of the critical case, and shows how untenable this part of the theory is. Then he calls notice to passages in Genesis which are undeniably pre-Mosaic. These should make us careful as to the interpretation we may put on the undoubted fact that some post-Mosaic elements are to be found in the Pentateuch. Far from causing us to deny the Mosaic authorship of the work, these passages, when considered in the light of the traces of pre-Mosaic date, should lead us to see that the bulk of the Pentateuch must have existed in a more or less complete state before the redactors gave it its present form. From this our author returns to the textual criticism of the Divine appellations. He cites Wildeboer as to the importance of the clue, and points out that the discovery of the omission to use the resources of textual criticism simply removes the basis of the whole of the modern criticism. He shows by concrete instances how a scientific use of the ancient materials removes difficulties from the Massoretic text, and dwells on the versional variants as to the Divine appellations in Genesis. From this he proceeds to consider Exodus vi. 3 and discusses the significance of the Hebrew conception of a name. He quotes McCurdy as saying

of the Semitic peoples: "The name was not a label, as it is with us, but a characteristic"; and he illustrates the Old Testament idea with a wealth of biblical passages. He adopts the reading "made known" in this verse of Exodus, but he does not notice that it is undoubtedly the reading of the Vulgate and Onkelos. This is followed by a long and very interesting discussion of the real significance of the utterance "I am the LORD"; and a sketch of the stages of revelation in the Pentateuch succeeds by a natural transition. And then he returns to the consideration of the division into sources, and shows how it fails to fit in with the textual and other facts and with the history of revelation.

In a short notice it is not possible to do full justice to a book that should be read to be appreciated. Every page bears witness to the author's wide reading, up-to-date scholarship, and keen interest in the subject. There is reason to believe that the volume will not long stand alone in the literature of Continental Europe in laying stress on the textual facts. And we sincerely hope that it may be followed by many more works from the same pen, which may serve to make the ripe fruits of Dr. Troelstra's fine scholarship, sound judgment, and deeply religious feeling available to readers all over the world.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

A SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. F. ERNST SPENCER, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Haggerston. London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1912.

Mr. Spencer is an able and learned clergyman of the Church of England who has long been well known for his writings on the Old Testament. He has now published a short introduction, which is remarkable for its very conservative tone. The first two chapters are devoted to general topics which affect what the Germans call *Einleitungswissenschaft* as a whole; the remainder of the book is concerned with the treatment of the individual books of the Old Testament. In

my opinion those first chapters are the best in the book. They are marked by a sense of proportion and a literary feeling that are very rare in writers on the Bible, which has fallen very largely into the hands of unintelligent pedants, and afford a very welcome contrast to the general literature of the subject. Here are a few of his sayings: "I could wish indeed that a sense of the literary beauty and poetry of the O. T. had a stronger hold on every man's consciousness" (p. 3). "The great, unique, and distinguishing feature of the O. T. in all its parts is a sense of the 'living God'" (*ibid.*). "We are not in an iron-bound universe, but in a universe permeated by the action and speech of the Father and Creator" (p. 4). There is very much in this part of the book with which hearty concurrence may be expressed.

Of the special part of the introduction I am able to speak less highly. Mr. Spencer's reading is certainly wide, but it is less wide than it should be. Thus he bases an argument on Gaster's Samaritan book of Joshua in obvious ignorance of the fact that this is known to be a modern composition of which no part is old.¹ Again, he appears to have no acquaintance with the work of Dahse, Schlögl, Griffiths, or Van Hoonacker. It is not particularly to the credit of conservative scholarship that conservative writers should so often be ignorant of the best that has been done on their own side. Moreover, he is much too fond of relying on bygone German theologians. Germans as a race have far too little appreciation of, or sympathy with, the Hebrew genius ever to produce any first-rate work on the literature of the Old Testament, and I cannot think that any value attaches to the opinions of dead German professors on such subjects. One of the misfortunes of biblical students at the present moment is that English and American professors attach an altogether disproportionate weight to German opinion, and I cannot help feeling sorry that so able a man who knows so much better should have written anything that might be held to lend countenance to such procedure.

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, November 21, 1908, col. 665.

Nevertheless, the book is an able and readable presentation of much important matter in short compass.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

London, England.

SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE BIBLE. By LOUIS WALLIS, author of "An Examination of Society," formerly Instructor in Economics and Sociology in the Ohio State University. 8vo. Pp. xxxv, 308. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1912. \$1.50, *net*.

This author's confidence in the Wellhausen theory concerning the composite character and the late date of the Pentateuch is so sublime as to pass into the ridiculous. On page 33 he calls this theory "a conclusion of modern science, just as definite and certain as the established laws and principles of chemistry and physics." In justification of this statement he gives three, and only three, specimens of evidence.

First, the reference to the "Captivity" in Judges xviii. 30, which he assumes to be proof that the whole book was compiled as late as 800 B.C.; whereas, all it proves is that, for many centuries, the book has been subject to the incorporation of some transcriptional errors and the insertion of occasional glosses, of which this is of a kind such as most naturally and frequently occurs.

Secondly, "Dan" occurs in Gen. xiv. 14 as the name of a place in northern Palestine; whereas, in Judges xviii. 27-29, a Dan which is referred to somewhere in that region is said to have been called Laish up to that time. But this, also, may have been a gloss like the preceding, or, more likely still, another Dan.

Thirdly, in Gen. xii. 6, in speaking of Abram's coming to Shechem, it is said that "the Canaanite was then in the land." The author would interpret this to mean "the Canaanite was then in the land but is there no longer"; whereas, it just as naturally means "the Canaanite was then in the land, as he still is." To compare such evidence as this to that by which the laws and principles of chemistry and physics are established is so puerile that one might well be excused from any

further consideration of the author's views; and in this one would not be far from wrong. Not being, as he says, an expert "in literary and historical investigation of the Bible," the author everywhere accepts the evolutionary view of Old Testament history, which, though still having wide currency in England and America, is being rapidly superseded on the Continent by saner views more closely akin to those which have been generally accepted from earliest times. This slavish acceptance of a theory of biblical criticism of which the author confessedly is not a competent judge vitiates the whole volume. There can be no proper criticism of the *Sociology of the Old Testament* without a correct understanding of its history.

THE SOURCE OF THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION: A Critical History of Ancient Tradition. By EDOUARD DUJARDIN. Revised Edition. Translated by JOSEPH MCCABE. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 307. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company.

The extravagances of criticism are beyond all estimate. A few years ago there appeared a very learned book aiming to prove that all the Old Testament literature was the product of Jewish rabbis of the middle centuries of the Christian era. A member of Parliament was found to adopt the views and to give his fortune for their propagation. The author of this volume does not go so far, but his theory is hardly less extravagant, for he maintains that "the Mosaic books, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, were composed during the fourth, and at the beginning of the third, century." Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah were later. The prophetic books "were composed in the second part of the fourth, and in the course of the third, century." The Hagiographical books "were composed during the second and first centuries" B.C. (p. xvi). Respecting the prophets, the author holds that they are, one and all, "fictitious characters invented by the Jewish writers to figure in the history of their country. The prophetic books are literary compositions which their authors put forward as the works of these characters. They are imaginative works published as works that have reality: books of sermons which

are presented as genuine" (p. 122). Like the preceding volume referred to, this must be relegated to the list of literary curiosities and of illustrations of misdirected scholarship.

THE RELIGIONS OF MODERN SYRIA AND PALESTINE. (The Bross Library. Vol. V.) By FREDERICK JONES BLISS, Ph.D., author of "Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894-1897," "The Development of Palestine Exploration," etc. 12mo. Pp. xiv, 354. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912. \$1.50, *net*.

Naturally enough the trustees of the Bross Foundation have turned to Dr. Bliss to present the subject treated of in this volume. His long residence in Syria and his explorations in Palestine have fitted him, above all others, to treat the numerous complicated religious sects of that region. The volume is about equally divided between the Christian sects and the Mohammedan. The author cherishes the hope that the influence of American missions in the Turkish Empire will prove the seed which will produce a reformation within the old churches of the region. There are many hopeful signs of progress in that direction. More than one-quarter of the students of the Syrian Protestant College of Beirut do not belong to any Christian body, but they go out to exert an untold influence among Moslems.

PERIODICAL ARTICLES ON RELIGION, 1890-1899. Compiled and Edited by ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON. 8vo. Pp. 876. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This volume represents an enormous amount of painstaking labor. Its value is limited by the fact that it is an author index merely, and not an index of subjects. But this is inevitable, and not so much of a drawback as it might seem, since it is pretty well known what subjects certain persons are accustomed to write upon. As the volume includes references to various weekly as well as monthly and quarterly publications, a prominence is given to some writers of minor importance which would seem excessive. But altogether the work is one which no library can afford to do without.

THE COMPOSITION OF MATTER AND THE EVOLUTION OF MIND: Immortality a Scientific Certainty. Crown 8vo. Pp. 176. London: The Walter Scott Publishing Company; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912.

The author asserts that "this little book is not a philosophical speculation, nor is it a theory. It is a brief statement of fundamental facts corroborated by every development of Science." A perusal of the volume, however, makes upon us the impression that there is little in it but speculation and theory, and little to stimulate a confident belief in personal immortality.

**The Griffith and Rowland Press, Philadelphia, Boston,
Chicago, St. Louis, Toronto.**

SEED THOUGHTS FOR RIGHT LIVING. By ALVAH SABIN HOBART, D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Crozer Theological Seminary; author of "Silent Partner," "Key to New Testament," "Tillage of the Heart," etc. 12mo. Pp. 303. 50 cents, *net*.

The Pilgrim Press, Boston, New York, Chicago.

THE MISSION OF THE PROPHET. By GEORGE A. GORDON, Minister of the Old South Church, Boston. 12mo. Pp. 32. 25 cents, *net*.

THE RELIGIOUS USES OF MEMORY: A Sermon. By the Rev. S. PARKES CADMAN, Pastor of The Central Congregational Church, Brooklyn, New York City. 12mo. Pp. 32. 50 cents, *net*.

ON IMMORTALITY. By WILFRED T. GRENFELL, M.D. (Oxon.), Superintendent of the Labrador Medical Mission. 12mo. Pp. 35. 50 cents, *net*.

THE CULTURE OF RELIGION: Elements of Religious Education. By EMIL CARL WILM, D.D., Professor of Philosophy in Washburn College; formerly Fellow in the Sage School of Philosophy, Cornell University; Assistant in Philosophy, Harvard University. 12mo. Pp. xi, 204. 75 cents, *net*.

**Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, Chicago, Toronto,
London, and Edinburgh.**

SUNRISE. "Behold, He Cometh." An Introduction to a Study of the Second Advent. By G. CAMPBELL MORGAN, D.D. 16mo. Pp. 95. 50 cents, *net*.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

SOME OLD EGYPTIAN LIBRARIANS. By ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON. Librarian of Princeton University. 12mo. Pp. 93. 75 cents, *net*.

THE CHRISTIAN HOPE: A Study in the Doctrine of Immortality. (Studies in Theology.) By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Ph.D., D.D., Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, author of "The Essence of Christianity," "Christian Theology in Outline," etc. 12mo. Pp. xi, 216. 75 cents, *net*.

Sherman, French, and Company, Boston.

ENDEAVORS AFTER THE SPIRIT OF RELIGION. By ARTHUR G. BEACH. 12mo. Pp. 124. \$1.00, *net*.

Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions.

SOUTH AMERICAN PROBLEMS. By ROBERT E. SPEER. 12mo. Pp. xiii, 270. 75 cents, *net*.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT IN THE CHURCHES. By SHAILER MATHEWS, Dean of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. 12mo. Pp. vi, 66. 50 cents, *net*.

A STUDY OF AUGUSTINE'S VERSIONS OF GENESIS: A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Literature in Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Department of Latin). By JOHN S. MCINTOSH. 8vo. Pp. x, 130. 75 cents, *net*.

The Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

WHAT I TELL MY JUNIOR CONGREGATION. A Series of Object Sermons Preached to the Junior Congregation of Summit Presbyterian Church, Germantown, Pa., by the Pastor, ROBINSON P. D. BENNETT, M.A., for several years State Secretary of Junior Christian Endeavor in the State of New Jersey, and for many years a "Children's Preacher." With an Introduction by ALEXANDER HENRY, D.D., Secretary of The Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work. 12mo. Pp. 173. \$1.00, *net*.

THE TACTICS OF THE HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
REVIEW.

THE January number of the *Harvard Theological Review* included an article by Professor Kemper Fullerton which contained some incidental references to my controversy with Dr. Skinner and the general editors of the *International Critical Commentary*. They were not well-informed, and Dr. Fullerton fell into obvious error. As a result he made some remarks which were unjust to me and must have misled any of his readers who had no independent knowledge of the subject. Accordingly I wrote to the editors of the *Review*, drawing their attention to the fact that an article in their publication did me injustice and asking to be allowed to reply. In due course I received a very courteous acknowledgment of receipt from Mr. J. H. Ropes, the secretary of the editors. This was subsequently followed by the subjoined correspondence, which throws a very interesting light on the methods by which it is sought to maintain the documentary theory:—

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

7 March, 1912.

My dear Sir:

I have presented the request contained in your letter of February 12, to the editors of the *Harvard Theological Review*.

The editors instruct me to say that they do not think it advisable that the controversy incidentally alluded to on page twenty-four of the number for January, 1912, should be reopened in the pages of the *Review*. Should you, however, desire to disavow a purpose to impute a wrong motive to Dr. Skinner and the editors of the *International Critical Com-*

mentary, they are willing to insert a brief editorial note containing a statement that you make such a disavowal.

Yours very truly,

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

HAROLD M. WIENER, Esq.

9 OLD SQUARE,
LINCOLN'S INN, W. C.

March 20, 1912.

My Dear Sir,

I am obliged to you for your letter of the 7th inst. and for the pains at which you have been with regard to my request.

This is the first instance within my experience in which a journal that has published adverse criticism on me has refused to follow the ordinary course of considering a reply. The practice usually adopted by papers is that suggested by the elements of fair play, viz: to give a hearing to anybody who desires to answer strictures that may have been made on him *in absentia*. Your editors do not recognise any obligation to follow this course. Nay, they go further and seek to dictate to me what line I should take without in the least knowing what facts I have at my disposal. This innovation on the usual procedure may serve the temporary interests of individuals: it cannot but be detrimental to the fundamental interests of scholarship and justice: and I must express my regret that the representatives of the theological faculty of a great University should so far have forgotten what they owe to their *alma mater*, their public and scholarship in general as to adopt such a course.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD M. WIENER.

JAMES HARDY ROPES, Esq.

CHARGE OF THE STONEWALL REGIMENT.¹

BY PROFESSOR GABRIEL CAMPBELL, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

[Our esteemed contributor, Professor Campbell, was a student in Michigan State University at the opening of the war, having graduated from the Michigan Normal College. The students in these two institutions formed a Company in the Stonewall Regiment, electing Professor Campbell Captain.]

A sultry, dull, September, Sabbath morn
Woke us unrested — much inclined to scorn
The unwelcome bugle. Five weary days,
We've toiled beneath the overpowering blaze
Of yonder southern sun. Five weary nights,
We've marched across the thirsty plains and heights
Of cheerless Maryland; and still we go
Undaunted to dislodge the haughty foe.

Toil makes our scanty breakfast relish well;
But e'er 't is ended hasty tidings tell
That Lee has made a stand. Burnside is mounted —
A smile upon his winning face. Recounted
Are the orders. We, his first brigade,
Will take the left, cross the contested glade
And carry Fox's Gap. Then comes, "Fall in," —
An undertone runs down the line, "Fall in."

Quick rations are finished; the rammers are sprung,
And waist-belts are buckled, and knapsacks are slung.
As soon all are marshaled and cheeringly stand
Awaiting — 't is given — the word of command.
"The Union Forever," they sing as they face
And advance by the flank — every man in his place.

¹"The Seventeenth Michigan, Col. Withington, performed a feat which may vie with any recorded in the annals of war" (Report of the Battle of South Mountain, Sept. 14, 1862, by General Willcox).

The old, starry Flag waves proudly and high
So fondly caressed by the soft autumn sky;
While the Eagle, extending his wings on the air,
Seemed to whisper of Victory hovering there.
Lo, churchbells now chiming in sweetest accord
Proclaim to the Faithful the Joy of the Lord.

But strange rumbling sounds that rise on the ear
Inspire to valor, yet waken to fear,
As louder and nearer with ponderous roll
The dire knells of Orcus toll — toll — toll.

We reach the hill-top and stormfully riven
South Mountain before us aspires to heaven;
Around his huge head incessant is curled
The smoke of those cannon that quiver the world.
The swift, traitor shells with deafening sound,
Now crash in the air, now recoil to the ground.

But just as we win the foot of the mount
Their batteries cease. O who can recount
The pleasure it gave? We seek to ascend
The steep, narrow way to the summit, and bend
To the task 'neath the scorching noon. While down
Roll streams from our cheeks flushed, dusty, and brown.

But what a whelming spectacle
Appalls the soldier's eye,
They enfilade our rising flank
With masked artillery.
They charge our battery, seize our guns,
And wheeling them around,
They pour a withering volley forth
That mows scores to the ground.

Up gallops gallant Willcox
Who led our foremost van,
And shouts as he approaches us,
"Is this my Michigan?
Form into line." The word — 't is done.
See, every man looks pale.
A few lie silent at our feet
Who ne'er will tell the tale.

The fated Regiment stands firm —
Unflinching mid the roar;
Her ensign waves the stars and stripes,
Ne'er loved so much before.
"Forward." We march: Up — upward still —
We're almost at the hight; —
When, oh! a double-shotted fire
Annihilates our sight.

Down drop we to the earth and cling
Close to the mother sod,
And trusting souls with one accord
Resign their fate to God.
Dread shrine upon the mount. Blest Shrine!
Tho' war its thunders bring,
Lo, fleecy clouds are Temple walls;
The Lord of Hosts is King.

At length the voice of Withington
Makes every heart enlarge.
Up-springing at the welcome word,
We rally for the charge.
Sudden in front — what raving shout —
Would memory could expel —
As on the foremost rebel line
Like maddened wolves we fell.

Back driven from their firm stockades
They rush with hideous groan,
And rally with redoubled strength
Behind great walls of stone.
On sweeps the line of Union men,
With bristling bayonet all.
Three volleys and a charge! Great God!
It clearly scales the wall.

They rally yet — and yet again —
Fiendish mid reeking blood.
Nor rebel steel, nor walls of stone
Can check the loyal flood;
But just as o'er that mountain top
Reflects the setting sun
Our victor shouts sent to the sky
Proclaim the Battle won.

Back over mingled friend and foe
We move as shuts the day;
And there recline upon our arms
To watch the night away.
And as to heaven's calm, peaceful vault
We turn the unresting eye,
We feel that we have struck one blow
For God and Liberty.

To be Published in September

The Origin and Antiquity of Man

A NEW VOLUME BY

George Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

This volume contains the matured results of the author's prolonged investigations of the subject, considered from every point of view.

Its fifteen chapters are entitled: I. Scientific Methods of Approach; II. The Historical and Archaeological Evidence; III. The Fossilistic Argument; IV. Origin of the Race of Europe; V. Origin of the American Indians; VI. Significance of the Glacial Period; VII. Oriental Man in America; VIII. Man and the Lava Beds of the Pacific Coast; IX. Glacial Man in Europe; X. Supposed Evidence of Tertiary Man; XI. Glacial Man in Central Asia; XII. The Physiological Argument; XIII. The Psychological Argument; XIV. The Biblical Scheme; XV. Summary and Conclusions.

500 pages, with numerous illustrations. (2 inc. cloth.

\$2.00, net; postage, 15 cents.)

OBERLIN, OHIO: BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

Until September 1, 25 per cent discount on advance orders

Title: _____

Bibliotheca Sacra Company

OSHTON, 1909, U. S. A.

Please send me Wright's *Origin and Antiquity of Man*, in which I have
to pay \$1.25 on receipt of the volume postpaid.

Name: _____

Address: _____

C. O. B. _____

City: _____

TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE AUTUMN

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism

BY

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D.,

Lecturer on Biblical Archaeology in Xena Theological Seminary, Archæological Editor of the Sunday School Times, etc.

This volume is the most thorough statement of the Value of Archaeological Evidence in Criticism of the Bible yet in English. It is the result of personal study by one for many years engaged in actual research work in Bible lands.

The volume is prepared by an introduction by Professor James Orr, D.D. The work of the author is divided into three parts. Part I. discusses the foundations of archaeology in criticism, showing, in brief chapters, that only archaeology is bringing forth new facts on the questions raised by criticism. Part II. in ten chapters, gives the history of the testing of critical theories by archaeological facts. The treatment of this portion of the subject, though concise, is strongly suggestive. Part III. in seven chapters, presents the progress of archaeological research in testing the biblical narrative and in solving questions raised by criticism.

224 pages, 12mo, cloth. \$1.50, net; postage, 15 cents.

Oberlin, Ohio: Bibliotheca Sacra Company

Until October 1, 25 per cent discount on advance orders.

Price

Bibliotheca Sacra Company,

Oberlin, Ohio, U. S. A.:

Please send me KYLE'S DECIDING VOICE OF THE MONUMENTS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM, for which I agree to pay \$1.25 on receipt of the volume promised.

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

A Religious and Sociological Quarterly

EDITED

C. FREDERICK WRIGHT

ASSOCIATED WITH

FRANK M. FOSTER, JAMES GORDAY, CHARLES F. KENNEDY, FRANK J. LINDSAY,
H. A. SMITH, WILLIAM S. DAWSON, HERBERT W. MASON,
HELEST W. MASON, A. S. ROOT, MERTON C. SILL,
W. H. DWIGHT THOMAS

CONTENTS

PROFESSOR PETRIE'S EXCAVATIONS AT HELIOPOLIS

THE MINISTRY OF PAIR HILL	William Grove Kyle	353
THE QUESTION OF A REFORM OF COMMUNISM	Edward M. Martin	363
JOHN HENRY NEWMAN: A STUDY	Henry C. Sheldon	351
"EXILE AND HOME: ITS PLACE IN REVELATION"	George Hys Bewardman	316
NEW METHODS OF INQUIRY CONCERNING THE PENTATEUCH	Harold W. Wilson	327
PROBLEMS OF THE PASSION WEEK	Johannes Baer	357
LEONIA THE RABBI	Alfred Austin-Hopwood	361
NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS	Lester Keston	383
THE ONLY WAY: A CORRESPONDENCE		399
INDEX		377
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION AND CHURCHES IN BIBLE READING	Herbert W. Mason	727

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY

Twentieth Century Company Building, 2nd Floor
222 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

MONTHLY NUMBER 75 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00

Entered at the Post Office at Chicago as second-class matter.

Books by Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B.

Barrister-at-Law, Lincoln's Inn, London

THE COUP DE GRÂCE TO THE WELLHAUSEN CRITICS

Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism

255 pages, 8vo, cloth. \$1.50, net; postage, 12 cents

The Origin of the Pentateuch

A Comprehensive Answer to the Wellhausen Critics

150 pages, 8vo, paper. 50 cents, postpaid

THE WELLHAUSEN CRITICS IN EXTREMIS

Pentateuchal Studies

A Continuation of the Author's Detailed Discussions contained in his "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism"

350 pages, 8vo, cloth. \$3.00, net; postage, 15 cents

The interest of these works lies in the fact that they come "from the pen of a Jew contending for the validity of his ancient Scriptures, yet on lines most of which a Christian can heartily appropriate; further, that the writer is a layman of highly trained mind in his own legal profession, to whom questions of law and evidence present a more familiar aspect than they do to the theologian; further still, that he is a man of large scholarly equipment, a skilled Hebraist, well versed in the critical literature of the day, English, Continental, and American, familiar as few are with Septuagint, Samaritan, and other version lore, and capable of wielding a vigorous, argumentative pen. There is nothing hackneyed in Mr. Wiener's style of argument. If conservative, he is conservative on his own lines; he holds, daring, ingenious, fertile in suggestion; a writer who, whether one always agrees with him or not, invariably gives his readers something worth thinking about."—Rev. Professor JAMES ORR, D.D., in the *British Weekly*

Address BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, Oberlin, Ohio

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

PROFESSOR PETRIE'S EXCAVATIONS AT HELI- OPOLIS, THE BIBLICAL ON.

BY THE REVEREND MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D.,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

RECENTLY a one-time city engineer, a man of affairs in the business world, asked me, "What does a ruined city of Egypt look like?" Such a question from such a man revealed the general lack of information on the subject among even the most intelligent who have not been in Egypt — and, alas, not a few who have been there. No really intelligent conception of the work of exploration of a ruined Egyptian city can be gained until there is first some clear vision of the appearance of the city before the spade of the excavator touches it. So, what does the ruin at On look like? It is a desert, with a wall around it, and an oasis in the middle of it.

"THE DUST OF AGES."

The desert here at On is "the dust of ages" still holding everything in its grasp. Descriptions of Egypt, and pictures of Egypt, have much to do with stone, — stone temples, stone statues, stone obelisks, gigantic stone structures of many kinds, even tombs cut in the solid rock. All this is magnificent,

Vol. LXIX. No. 276. 1

but it is not Egypt. Egypt is not stone: Egypt is mud. There is more of mud than of all other things combined. The ancient Egyptians honored their gods in temples of stone, their kings, who were little gods, in statues of stone, and their dead, who according to their theology became divine, in stone tombs and sarcophagi; but they themselves, the people, lived in mud. Cities were built almost wholly of mud. The poorer suburbs and towns were of houses made of corn-stalks plastered with mud; the better buildings of the city had walls of mud brick. In either case the mud was only sun-dried. They were "dust" mixed with water, molded, and dried and hardened in the sun. When the mud walls perished, they returned again to "dust." "How long did they last?" That depended so much upon conditions that the question cannot be answered. Egypt is for the most part a rainless land; yet down north it rains in torrents, and up south it does sometimes rain most unexpectedly. Besides this, an unusually high Nile might catch the foundations of many houses in the waters of the inundation, and, by melting away the first few lower courses of mud brick, ruin a large portion of the city. No great loss ensued: it had cost but little to build the houses, it cost little to replace them. The walls were beaten down, and the place was leveled, and was considerably raised by the debris of the ruin. The new house was built upon this platform. Thus cities have literally *risen*, in Egypt, until they stood upon a mound. Every village and town of modern Egypt is thus lifted up above the plain. Thus this old city of On grew, and *arose*, if we may adapt Tennyson's lines, upon stepping-stones of her dead self to higher things. When at last the final ruin of the city came, and the place was abandoned, the waters of the inundation, and the torrential rains of the delta, and the fierce winds from the desert soon wore

down the walls of the houses and distributed the *débris* until the whole area was but heaps of "the dust of ages." This is On, about four square miles of "dust."

The wall of this old city, strange to say, is marked by yonder deep broad ditch, seventy feet wide by twenty to thirty feet deep; though on the western side and on a portion of the eastern side there is still a ridge which marks the ancient wall, now buried by the sand and soil drifting before the desert winds. The ditch is another tragic monument—we might almost say a melodramatic monument—of the frailty of human greatness. For these colossal walls were also of brick, made from the surface of the soil and dried in the sun. They thus are the richest of the soil of Egypt, made largely from the recent sediment brought down by the inundation. The farmers of modern Egypt, for how many centuries nobody knows, have been wise enough in their day to perceive the value of these mud bricks as fertilizer for their fields of beans and peas and clover. So they have dug out these mud bricks, reducing them again to "the dust of ages" in the process, and have spread them over their fields and gardens. So the wall of On is now in large part a moat around the heaps of ruins.

Now, about the oasis in the center of the city. It is neither more nor less than more "dust" irrigated. Since the houses were built of bricks made from the mud of the surface of the Nile Valley, and so contained the richest of the soil, the only reason that the ruin of the city is now for the most part desert is, that the mound of many cities upon which the last one was built is now above the utmost reach of the inundation or of convenient irrigation. The rains come only during a short season, and for the most of the year these heaps are as dry as the sand of the Sahara. But the oasis; what then makes

the oasis? Ah, that is the secret of the old Egyptian cities — the entrancing secret that has brought to this place Professor Petrie, one of the world's greatest archæologists and the world's most experienced excavator. The oasis is a low place which is reached by the waters of the inundation or by easy irrigation. It is an oasis at On: at Memphis it is a lake. Whether an oasis or a lake, this low place marks the site of the great temple of the old city.

“But were not the Egyptians great engineers? Why did they thus build their temples on such low ground?” They were great engineers, among the greatest the ancient world produced. But there was a greater engineer, nature herself, by the operation of the power of God through her laws, which defeated them in a way of which they seem not to have dreamed. The temples were built upon the level ground, but, natural laws in operation throughout millenniums of time have changed the level of the whole surface of the land. The inundation is a flood of muddy water. Muddy water leaves a sediment wherever it flows. The faster it flows, the less is the deposit: the slower it moves, the greater is the amount of sediment it leaves behind. Thus the whole surface of the valley has arisen by this deposit of sediment, less rapidly where the current of the river runs in its channel, much more rapidly in the still waters of the overflow, which sometimes lie for weeks with no perceptible current. Thus the land has arisen more rapidly and the bed of the river more slowly, but both have risen. In the course of millenniums this change in level has amounted to eight or ten feet for the bed of the river, and still more in places for the surface of the fields. But the temple, being of stone and swept clean day by day, stayed down where it was built and gained nothing by the annual deposit from the inundation. That is why it is

now represented by an oasis or a lake in the center of the ruins of the city. This is true in some measure of all the oldest temples which were built in the valley near the river.

But this is not yet all of the strange story. The Nile never keeps within its channel. When it is high enough to run over its banks upon the land it does so, but at all times it runs under the banks through the porous soil. This is called its "infiltration," and it results in the Nile, at any given time, extending as far beyond the channel on either side as the stage of water at the moment will admit. The higher the level of the water, the farther the infiltration reaches, but always *at the same level as the water in the river*. So, as the channel of the river, century by century, lifted the river itself higher and higher, the level of the water of infiltration kept pace until, at last, it was above the floor of the temple even at the season of the lowest Nile. Then gods and goddesses, priests and ceremonial, were driven out, and the temple was abandoned. Nature religion was thus driven out by nature's God.

So our old temple at On is to-day under the green fields of the Khedive's tenants.

"SQUATTERS."

With the exception of those green fields which cover the temple, the whole area of the ancient city continues to this day as barren as the desert. But, like the desert, it is not entirely forsaken. There are some squatters upon it. A village has occupied one small quarter, in order to be above the inundation and to save cultivable land. Back of this village in the "dust" is another, a corn-stalk village, of the Bedouin, and between that and the west wall are the camps of some roving bands of these Ishmaelites of the desert. And

yonder, beyond the government canal near the west wall, are still other squatters, who have built for themselves a low, rambling, one-story house of mud brick. They have taken the trouble also to dig ditches in front, to inclose a small yard (not a lawn!), and within that a still smaller private inclosure is made by a mud-brick wall. That is Professor Petrie's camp. Not much of the money of the Excavation Fund is spent in providing accommodations for the archæologists. Indeed "efficiency," about which we hear so much in these days, and economy are practised to the utmost. The Professor is as good a business man as excavator. So a small mud house is erected, consisting of a series of little rooms, "state-rooms" they would be called on shipboard, judged by their size only. They are sufficient in number to accommodate the archæologist and his helpers, allowing one "state-room" to each, one for a dining-room and general reception-room, and still another for the cook with his pots and pans. The brick for the house were made and dried on the spot. A large brick-yard is only a half mile distant, but it is cheaper to make the brick on the ground than to transport them. So they are made on the ground.

It was my privilege to spend most of the season of 1912 at Heliopolis with Professor Petrie. On the 26th of February, a cold, dismal, winter day with a chilly west wind, the Professor set out from the camp to survey the site of the great work upon which he was about to enter. "Survey" means, first of all, at an archæologist's camp, very literally to "look over." Much may be seen concerning a ruined city by simply walking about with one's eyes fixed upon the ground. These reddish pieces of pottery so abundant on the surface are modern. Countless seasons of Bedouin "squatters" who have broken their pots here, and of village women who have

trudged back and forth, occasionally letting a jar fall, have left these fragments. But there are other pieces here. This handle of a grayish Greek amphora is from the eighth century B.C. There is another, and another. There are many of them. Many flat sherds, also, of the same pots are mingled with the modern reddish fragments. Ah, here is a curious, squat little vase with handles. It is of the peculiar pottery usually attributed to the Hyksos. Yonder a piece of the city wall also is visible. Those large brick are certainly of the eighteenth or nineteenth dynasty. Modern times here mingle with the ancient world from the eighth century B.C. back to the remote and uncertain age of the Hyksos invaders. The Romans are not in this company at all, nor the Copts, nor that mixed population which grew for centuries after the Christian era. "Ah," said the Professor, "that is good. We will not have to dig through twenty feet of Roman rubbish to reach the ancient history of Egypt." This old city has been practically abandoned since the Persian invasion. This is ideal for the archæologist, whose greatest bugbear is the mingling, sometimes the inextricable commingling, of the ages. So we learn much human history in this first morning walk.

But "survey" has also, for the excavator, the more technical sense in which it is used by the engineer. Every field and piece of ground which is to be excavated must be literally measured and plotted by days of work with rod and line and level. The highest point near the middle of the ruin is taken as that with which the level of every other point will be compared. This wearisome, dusty work was done, and the "squatters" were ready to begin.

PROSPECTING FOR HISTORY.

The popular notion is, that the one great desire of exca-

vators is for "finds" — treasures of literature, art, and architecture. These are the things in which the public are chiefly interested, and which afford the large cash returns with which to make more excavations and to interest the readers of Reports so that they will subscribe more money for still more work to get more "finds," and so make another popular thrill. This is the treadmill circle around which the excavator must run. But the real value to the world of even these startling finds is, that they are witnesses in the story of the world's achievements. Often the unattractive object which the relic hunter would not buy, and of which the public hears or remembers little or nothing, tells more of human history than the statue or the necklace that is worth thousands of dollars. Beyond even such unattractive "finds" there are walls, houses, gateways, ruined foundations, fragments of obelisks, buried forever in the muddy water of the infiltration and which can be examined only with the fingers, that may make possible the writing down of more human history than a museum full of relics. The fact is, that the excavator is really *prospecting for history* and *hoping for "finds" to pay expenses*.

Here, for example, are these broken walls of houses upon which the work is begun near the camp. An inner wall is here clearly marked, running east and west. As it parallels the temple area, where is now the oasis, it is plainly the wall of the temenos inclosure, the sacred precincts surrounding the temple itself. Here first the Professor sought within these sacred precincts for the houses of the priests, and he was not disappointed. That low ravine-like channel running parallel to the wall on the side towards the temple area proves to be a street. On either side of it the banks, when disturbed, reveal the walls of houses. The temple area is very large, a

quarter of a mile wide by three-quarters of a mile long, with a still further long approach before it on the east. It might be expected that so large a temple would have many priests. This temenos wall inclosing so large a space has further confirmed that expectation. And here, row upon row, are the houses within the sacred place. Houses of the priests of On! "The priest of On" lived somewhere among these. But during the millenniums of the glory of this temple there were thousands of priests who ministered here. Though "the priest of On" may have been high priest, as he very probably was, from the definite article before his name, there is yet little likelihood of finding anything concerning him. But, who knows? Surprises always await the excavator. Exploration of ruins is a lottery. There are many blanks, but some great prizes.

But we are only prospecting, in order to find the great deposits of history here, and will return to uncover them completely in proper order. Professor Petrie now took his diggers far away, a mile or more to the eastern wall of the old city. If one stands at a point on the line of the axis of the green temple area which runs through the center of the ruins of the city, and looks toward the east, he will find a great break in the wall exactly in front of him. Of course the eastern gateway of the city was here. Many years of exploring work have given the Professor such skill in locating ruins that, having carefully surveyed the place and measured the ground for the pit to be dug, the workers came down exactly upon the foundations of the south leg of the great pylon. The brick wall of the city abutted upon the place, but every stone of the pylon had been removed by those who have used the ruins as a stone quarry. The carefully cut niche at the bottom of the pylon in which the foun-

dation deposits had been placed was found entirely filled with clean sand. Every tool was dropped, and the workmen gathered about while Professor Petrie put his hand into the sand to search for the precious little treasures once put there. Carefully he searched every part of the depository, but the sandy receptacle was empty. Those who had taken away the stone had known also to rob this treasure box. Nothing was left to us but a sigh of disappointment. Such is the experience of an excavator.

Work at the south side of the gateway was more encouraging. A building of Rameses II., with some of his titles on the side posts of the gateway, was found and largely excavated. An irrigation ditch which must not be disturbed prevented the work at one side. The building was empty.

Again the diggers are moved, — this time to the center of the ruins. It will be a surprise to learn that, important as was On in the old time, and great as is the ruin which has continued down to these days, almost nothing has been learned concerning this place. Many years ago Lepsius surveyed the site and left a diagram which reveals little that cannot be seen in a few hours' examination of the site to-day. A few years ago the great Italian archæologist, Schiaparelli, did some work here which strangely has remained unpublished. But some things were given out which told of a remarkable inclosure wall of the great temple, a wall perforated with curious tunnels. The wall was about 130 feet broad and seemed to be a great circle or oval. The next point now in the prospecting for history was to cut this great wall. The "tunnels" were quickly found. It was also soon found that the diggers, seeing that the Professor was interested in "tunnels," had set themselves to oblige him by *digging one on their own account*. Query: Did Schiaparelli's diggers do the

same? However, the most careful search now made by several transverse cuttings showed conclusively four things: (1) that these so-called tunnels were only heaps of sand and mud composing a central core about which the bricks were laid on the sloping sides; (2) that thus the wall was not a perpendicular, but a sloping wall; (3) that there was no gateway on the axis of the temple opposite the great pylon on the east; (4) that the wall was an oval about 400 yards in its shortest diameter and of a length not yet determined.

Our prospecting for history is now coming to a climax; our search for great events in this old city seems about to be rewarded with startling success. It only remains to call to mind that out to the northeast some four miles, in 1906, Professor Petrie uncovered the ruin known as Tel el-Yehudiyeh and found what he believed to be an Hyksos camp, one of the fortified camps occupied by those invaders at their entrance to the land, at a time when they were still "bow people," who surrounded themselves with the sloping walls employed for defense with the bow. Professor Naville from his study of the great Harris papyrus, believed this place to have been in early times a sacred place immediately connected with On itself. It was also very near, and the Hyksos certainly did not always remain there under the very shadow of the great capital, but before they became masters of Lower Egypt must have become masters of On. When it is noted that the great wall at Tel el-Yehudiyeh and at On is the same in size, in construction, in shape, and in the peculiarity of having no gateway, it becomes a probability not likely to be overthrown (but which only the completion of the excavations can fully and finally substantiate), that the great wall surrounding the temple here at On is another Hyksos camp, made by those Bedouin invaders when they first became mas-

ters of the Capital of the North. This is an encouraging beginning of this wonderful work of excavation of one of the most extensive ruins in Egypt. Our prospecting has brought us to this place in history as a starting point under those very kings in whose dynasty Joseph became prime minister and was given as wife the daughter of "the priest of On." There certainly is earlier history here than this, but this makes a very dramatic starting point.

Additional pits near the obelisk discovered the foundations of a mate to that famous monument, and finally the gateway of the temple itself. Here we stand ready to enter within the sacred precincts at the beginning of the season of 1913.

ARTICLE II.

THE MINISTRY OF PAIN.

BY EDWARD M. MERRINS, M.D., WUCHANG, CHINA.

III.

THE first article on this subject indicated the great importance of the susceptibility to pain in connection with the development and nurture of the body, and the value of pain in the diagnosis and treatment of disease and injury. To guard against exaggeration, it also pointed out that pain is not always so dreadful as it seems, as proved by the actual experiences of the sick and wounded, even death itself, in the great majority of cases, being accompanied by little or no physical pain.

In a second article it was shown in connection with the development of mind that the faculty of memory, which makes education possible, was primarily the registration of painful impressions, and that the hardships and pains of the struggle for existence were a powerful stimulus to the acquisition of speech and mental power and to the development of the mechanical arts. Pain was also an aid to man's moral development on the parallel lines of the masculine and feminine virtues. Taking the narrative of Elijah's meeting with God in Horeb as a parable of the experiences of life which, through the emotions, the intellect, and the will, prepare the soul to hear the Divine voice, the slow and painful development of man's spiritual nature was next considered, special points being the lowly beginnings of religion, the modern interpretation of the "fall," the origin of prayer and sacrifice, the place of austerities in human life, the purificatory value

of pain which yet is not to be sought for its own sake, and the spiritual power which comes through the conquest of pain.

(2) *And after the wind an earthquake, but the Lord was not in the earthquake.* A movement towards religion commences in the desire of primitive man to discover the cause or the author of every external event or phenomenon. As the only source of activity with which he is acquainted is the action of the will, all objects which move, or which he believes capable of moving,—the heavenly bodies, clouds, winds, rain, fire, rivers, trees, corn, grass,—he concludes are animated by unseen beings or influences. Hence the personification of the forces of nature, and the origin of such myths as that of the earth-bearer, who supports the earth, and from time to time shakes it in anger or amusement. For man, in his ignorance and simplicity, thinks all these nature-beings are endowed, like himself, with will, passions, and feelings. Some of them appear to be friendly, but as he suffers much and in various ways, most of them appear to be unfriendly, and these he tries to propitiate by prayer and sacrifice.

The next step, the perception of the necessity of a Maker, is borne in upon the savage at a very early time, not upon every member of a tribe, but upon some peculiarly gifted individual, who imparts to his fellows the awe-striking idea of a mysterious, all-powerful Creator.¹ The creature who recognizes a Creator can hardly fail to feel his relationship to him as One to be feared or loved, and also there arises the desire to enter into communication with him by means of worship. Thus are produced the two fundamental factors of religion, as mentioned by the sacred writer, "He that comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is the rewarder of those who diligently seek him."

¹ Leuba, *The Psychological Origin and Nature of Religion*.

Confronted by the task of discovering secondary causes and of compelling nature to minister to his well-being, the life of man has been full of toil and pain. Indeed, according to St. Paul, the whole creation is groaning and travailling in pain, and will continue to do so until men win their spiritual kingdom, and manifestly become the sons of God. As we now know, Nature is not man's antagonist, but his helpmeet, the interpreter of God to him, and his deliverance is her own. But "at the first Wisdom will walk with him by crooked ways, and bring fear and dread upon him, and torment him with her discipline, until she may trust his soul and try him by her laws." So it has ever been. Toil, sorrow, dread, and the torment of discipline have been his portion. By floods and seas, fires and volcanoes, lightning and tempest, earthquakes and landslides, famine and drought, disease and injury, and in other stern ways, Nature has been teaching men her laws, and visiting with her judgments those who either wilfully or ignorantly neglect or violate them. Much of this suffering seems very cruel and purposeless. So religious a writer as Henry Drummond, describing man's progress in the face of difficulties, says, "Evil dogged each step with sinister and sometimes staggering malevolence." But there is no vengeance or malevolence to be found anywhere in nature. A truer conception is found in the familiar metaphor of Huxley, who compares life to a game of chess:—

"The chess-board is the world, the pieces are the phenomena of the universe, the rules of the game are what we call the laws of Nature. The player on the other side is hidden from us. We know that his play is always fair, just, and patient. But also we know to our cost, that he never overlooks a mistake, or makes the smallest allowance for ignorance. To the man who plays well the highest stakes are paid, with that sort of ever-flowing generosity with which the strong shows delight in strength. And one who plays ill is checkmated without haste and without remorse."

Slowly man has come to understand and obey the laws of Nature. Through much suffering, and when Nature is in her terrible moods, depressed by the sense of his impotence and insignificance, still he has pressed onward, ever at his best when the difficulties were greatest. He has wrested secrets of the greatest importance from her, and progress is now so rapid that every year witnesses increased mastery over physical forces.

“ Out of black disaster,
He arose to be the master
Of Earth and Water, Air and Fire.”

But this is only part of his conquest. In the long and hard struggle he has gained spiritual insight and strength, winning many a victory over primal fears and instincts, even in the presence of physical defeat. Undaunted by the certainty of suffering and death, in shipwrecks, fires, mining accidents, and other perils and dangers, men have performed the bravest deeds, the most thrilling acts of self-sacrifice. When the ship “ Birkenhead ” was sinking in shark-infested waters within sight of the African shore, not England only, but the whole world was proud of the four hundred and fifty soldiers and sailors who, summoned suddenly from their hammocks to assemble on deck to meet their fate, in quiet order obeyed the word of command as calmly as if they were parading on shore, none trying to save themselves, as to do so meant the sacrifice of the women and children. Such deeds are an inspiration to the race, and glorify the pain which makes such heroism possible.

But the conflict is unconfined, and the heroism takes different forms. Not only the practice of medicine, but the investigations and duties of men of science generally, are often attended by considerable peril, from which they do not shrink

if mankind can be benefited. A recent instance may be cited of one who did much to make the X-rays more serviceable to military surgeons, who succumbed to a long and extremely painful disease induced by over-exposure of his body to the action of the rays. In a public appeal on his behalf, it was said that "words cannot depict the awful condition of the man who has sacrificed his means of livelihood, and shortened and distorted his life, for the benefit not only of his country, but of the whole human race." The account of his affliction acted as a warning to other workers in the same field, and as apparatus has now been devised for guarding the body against the undesired destructive effect of the rays, it is probably true that "his suffering, his martyrdom to the sacred cause of science, means the alleviation of pain and sickness in the future of countless thousands of suffering and tortured human beings throughout the world."¹

Notwithstanding the marvelous conquests and discoveries man has made, it may not be possible, perhaps it is not altogether desirable, that he shall have the power to avert all physical disaster, for the mystery, the grandeur, the terrible-ness of nature, lift the mind in awe and reverence to the Creator of all; and it cannot be denied that the fires, earthquakes, storms, and accidents, before which man is helpless, and which cause so much injury and loss of life, bind communities and nations together as nothing else does, in sympathy and brotherly helpfulness. But with increase of knowledge fear more and more departs. To those who know Nature's laws and live and work in harmony with them, her aspect is benignant, and to them she imparts her secrets. Fire and hail, snow and vapor, wind and tempest, are all seen to be fulfilling God's word. The uniform and unchangeable order of Na-

¹ *The Lancet*, January, 1910.

ture leads us to trust him when we enter the spiritual realm. The mountains are the symbol of his righteousness, and his cleansing judgments are as the great deep. It is in the great, lonely deserts, which bring home to the mind the littleness of man and the reality of the Eternal, that religious leaders of the world have found strength and inspiration. Taking a broad survey, the religious difference is very great between primitive man's abject fear of the multitudinous ghostly malignant powers which he believes are behind the forms of nature, and the love and admiration for God and nature expressed by the modern poet and religious seer:—

“And I have felt
A Presence that disturbs me with joy
Of elevated thoughts: a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and the mind of man:
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.”

Science also bears her testimony, even more strongly than the poets, to the order and beauty of nature. She affirms the words of the Psalmist that the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork, and there is no end to his greatness. As our knowledge increases, and veil after veil is removed from the face of nature, the more august and beautiful does it appear. And the marvelous discoveries now being made, so far from completing our knowledge, are but opening up new worlds. Addressing a society of distinguished scientists a year or two ago, its president closed with the words: “The sum of knowledge is at present a diverging, not a converging series. As we conquer peak after peak, we see in front of us regions full of interest and

beauty, but we do not see our goal, we do not see our horizon; in the distance tower still higher peaks, which will yield to those who ascend them still wider prospects, and deepen the feeling whose truth is emphasized by every advance in science, that great are the works of the Lord."

To reach the heights whence such glorious visions are obtained, a long, dark, and dangerous road has been traveled, yet who will dare say that the knowledge of God and of nature which man has gained, is not worth the journey and its dangers?

It may be objected that many have been wounded, and others have fallen by the way; in other words, that in the search for truth, many have failed to find their way to God through nature. Such lost travelers, when the quest was undertaken with a sincere and humble mind, are entitled to sympathy and respect, for they suffer vicariously for their kind. If we are indebted to geographical explorers who do no more than bring us the knowledge that the lands they have visited are bleak, desolate, uninhabitable, are we not indebted to those whose search for truth takes them to regions of doubt and negation, and proves to us that such regions can never be the permanent abiding place of the human spirit?

"To all who think, the world must at times appear overwhelming in the perplexity of causes; and some will always feel bound to say that they see no track through the maze. Such agnosticism,—reverent and tentative, not blatant and aggressive—is the cost some men must pay if mankind is to find truth at last. We who are Christians remember that the Godhead never shone forth in Christ so effulgently as in the moment when he felt himself forsaken of God, and we shall not think ill of those who, in the search for truth, fill up what remains of the sufferings of Christ."¹

Whatever touches and ennobles us in the lives and in the

¹ Temple, *The Nature of Personality* (1911).

voices of the past, writes Martineau, is a divine birth from human doubt and pain.

(3) *And after the earthquake a fire, but the Lord was not in the fire.* All sharp, painful experiences of life, the fiery trials, whether national, social, or individual, which we encounter, constitute the spiritual discipline which acts particularly on the will, refining and subduing it, and bringing it into harmony with the will of God.

First, as to national adversities. In these days, public sentiment in civilized lands is steadily becoming adverse to war on any pretense, and it is certainly hard to justify it by the fundamental principles of Christianity. In the past, however, in spite of all the misery and demoralization which followed in its train, it has done much to promote the spiritual interests of mankind. Just as it is well for society that degenerate family strains shall disappear, so it is well for mankind at large that degenerate nations shall disappear. Nowadays they perish by slow decay, but in former times they were usually exterminated by war. In all wars, each nation is fighting to uphold a certain character or ideal, though the issue may not be clearly perceived by the combatants at the time. It is fitting, therefore, that the better should survive. Between the Canaanites and the Hebrews, if one or the other had to perish, surely it was better for the race that the Jews survived, for salvation came of the Jews. But Christians need not go out of their way to defend the slaughter of helpless women and children, and all the other horrid cruelties of war common among barbarous and semi-barbarous peoples. The time came when the tree of Judaism itself had to be cut down to the roots, in order that a better stock should grow. Conquered and carried into captivity by the Assyrians and Babylonians, the Jewish people in their deep humiliation and

distress formed truer and more profound conceptions of their God. No longer solely as the God of their own small nation, one among many other gods, they now regarded him as the supreme ruler and moral governor of the whole world, and they realized, as never before, the necessity and power of prayer. As a nation they were purified by adversity and pain. "Ho! All ye that pass by the way, look ye and see if there be a pain like mine, the pain which was given me, with which Jehovah grieved me, in the day of the burning of his anger." In their turn, they were softened towards all the suffering they beheld around them, and knowing its connection with disobedience to the laws of God, they perceived their mission to other nations as the servant of God, and that in its performance they must suffer vicariously. So the Jewish nation became "our Mother of sorrows, at whose knees men learned their first prayers of confession and penitence. Other nations have been their teachers in art, and wisdom, and government. But she is their mistress in pain and in patience, teaching men with what conscience they should bear the chastening of the Almighty, with what hope and humility they should wait for their God."¹

Within a nation itself there is often a struggle between opposing spiritual tendencies accompanied by persecution, sorrow, and pain. The question arises, Are religious ideals worth suffering for, or are they not worth the shedding of a single drop of human blood? The long course of religious history gives no uncertain answer. A nation's life and prosperity are bound up with its ideals. When these are low and perishing, it must be saved by reformation, or its end is nigh. When reform does come, those who proclaim the new and higher ideals inevitably suffer at the hands of those who cling to the

¹ G. A. Smith, *The Minor Prophets*.

old ways, so that a man's foes may be those of his own household. But suffering accomplishes the ends desired. The ideals may be opposed successfully for a time, but they do not perish. "Be of good cheer, Master Ridley," said Latimer at the stake to his friend, "we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England, as I trust shall never be put out." In suffering so borne, the triumph of the human spirit over pain and death is plainly seen. Of Cranmer it is written: "He burnt, to appearance, without motion or pain; he seemed to repel the force of fire, and overlook the torture, by strength of thought." The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church, and of all godly liberty and progress. Passing to the individual, with his many troubles of mind, body, and estate, we may take disease, with its pains and incapacities, as the typical fiery trial which purifies and spiritualizes his nature; for, in one way and another, sickness has always directed the thoughts of men to the Unseen. The Lord is not in the fire, but often his voice is heard during or immediately after it. In early times the belief that disease was due to the departure of the soul from the body, or to demoniacal possession, led to the cure of disease being wholly a religious ceremony, sacrifice and prayer being offered to the gods or demons who were supposed to have inflicted it. A far higher conception was reached, as among the Jews, when all disease was regarded as the punishment of sin inflicted by the God of holiness. The conception is still true if it be granted that no disease occurs without physical cause, that it is the inevitable penalty for the neglect or violation of the beneficent laws of physiology and sanitation which God has ordained, though it is not always due to the ignorance or sin of the patient himself, and that, no matter how pious people

may be, sickness and pain will not disappear until all men live in perfect harmony with these laws.

The Christian church holds that physical suffering is sent by God, as its ancient collects and exhortations bear witness: "Dearly beloved, know this that Almighty God is the Lord of life and death, and of all things to them pertaining: as youth, strength, health, age, weakness, and sickness. Wherefore, whatsoever your sickness be, know you certainly that it is God's visitation." Where this belief prevails, great epidemics affect profoundly a nation's spiritual life. During the terrible epidemic of the Black Death in the fourteenth century, an unexampled spirit of remorse seized the minds of people everywhere. The fear of Christ fell upon all, noble and lowly, old and young. The melancholy chant of the penitent alone was heard. Enemies were reconciled, men and women vied with each other in splendid works of charity. Human nature would be exalted, writes the historian, if the countless noble actions which were performed in secret in times of most imminent danger, had been recorded for instruction of future generations.¹ But in every epidemic, from the earliest times down to the recent epidemic of pneumonic plague in Manchuria, there has never been wanting the spirit of splendid self-sacrifice among those attending the sick and dying.

The myths produced to account for these visitations, which were so mysterious to previous generations, have not been without value, as they preserved the idea of the necessity of vicarious suffering. One of the most striking is a Slavonic myth, in which the pestilence is personified as a gigantic human being, traveling through the land:—

"There sat a Russian under a larch tree, and the sunshine glared like fire. He saw something coming afar; he looked again:

¹Hecker, *The Black Death*.

It was the Pest-maiden, huge of stature, all shrouded in linen, striding towards him. He would have fled in terror, but the form grasped him with her long outstretched hand. 'Knowest thou the Pest?' she said, 'I am she. Take me on thy shoulders and carry me through all Russia; miss no village, no town, for I must visit all. But fear not for thyself, thou shalt be safe amid the dying.' Clinging with her long hands, she clambered on the peasant's back; he stepped onward, saw the form above him as he went, but felt no burden. First he bore her to the towns; they found there joyous dance and song; but the form waved her shroud, and joy and mirth were gone. As the wretched man looked round, he saw mourning, he heard the tolling of bells, there came funeral processions, the graves could not hold the dead. He passed on, and coming near each village heard the shriek of the dying, saw all faces white in the desolate houses. But high on the hill stands his own hamlet; his wife, his little children are there, and the aged parents, and his heart bleeds as he draws near. With strong grip he holds the maiden fast, and plunges with her beneath the waves. He sank; she rose again, but she quailed before a heart so fearless, and fled far away to the forest and the mountain."*

So it has been in every epidemic; the saviours perished, but they stayed the plague.

It is hardly necessary to dwell on the power which lies in prolonged bodily suffering to purify and ennoble the character of the individual, as instances must surely have come within the experience of all. "Before I was afflicted," writes the Psalmist, "I went astray, but now I observe thy word." When pain does its perfect work, there is acquired an indescribable beauty of the spirit rarely or never seen in those who have not suffered. There is neither rebellious complaint nor fretfulness. As some one has observed, if we want to judge of a religion we must try to study it as much as possible in the mind of its Founder; and when that is impossible, try to find it in the lonely chamber and in the sick room. The Christian religion bears this test supremely well. Its saints,

* Hanusch, Slav. Myths; Tylor, Primitive Culture.

smitten with sickness, in time bless God for all that has happened, and find, in their suffering, a ministry peculiarly their own. These are they:—

“To whom the night-watch is appointed. See!
They lift their hands and bless God in the night!
Whilst we are sleeping, those to whom the King
Has measured out a cup of sorrow, sweet
With His dear love, yet very hard to drink,
Are waking in his temple; and the eyes
That cannot sleep for sorrow or for pain
Are lifted up to heaven; and sweet low songs,
Broken by patient tears, arise to God.
Bless ye the Lord, ye servants of the Lord,
Which stand by night within his holy place
To give him worship! ye are priests to Him,
And minister around the altar, pale
Yet joyful in the night.”

This victory over suffering, it has been well said, is one of the strongest intimations and evidences of the immortality of the soul.¹ It is also an inspiration to all to suffer bravely.

“It is a tremendous moment when first one is called upon to join the great army of those who suffer. That vast world of love and pain opens suddenly to admit us one by one into its fortress. We are afraid to enter, yet how high is the call. It is as a trumpet speaking to us that cries aloud—‘It is your turn—endure. Play your part. As they endured before you, so now, close up the ranks, be patient and strong as they were.’ Since Christ came, this world of pain is no accident untoward or sinister, but a lawful department of life, with experiences, interests, adventures, hopes, delights, secrets of its own. These are all thrown open to us as we pass within the gates, things that we could never learn, or know, or see, so long as we were well.”²

The sufferings of little children, which cannot be the result of their own intelligent and wilful wrong-doing, who are too young to profit spiritually by it, are to many far more dis-

¹ Hardy, *The Gospel of Pain*.

² Canon Holland in the *Life of Romanes*.

treassing and more perplexing than the sufferings of adults.

“What purpose hath pain? Nay, thy quest is vain;
Earth hath no answer: If the baffled brain
Cries, 'Tis to warn, to punish, Ah, refrain!
When writhes the child, beneath the surgeon's hand,
What soul shall hope that pain to understand?
Lo! Science falters o'er the hopeless task,
And Love and Faith in vain an answer ask.”

Since the introduction of anæsthetics, children in civilized lands do not writhe under the surgeon's hand. The solidarity of the race and the law of vicarious suffering again point the way to the solution. Vicarious suffering may be either voluntary or involuntary, but in either case it must be borne until the race has been redeemed. The sufferings of children are vicarious, because due to the sins of others against, or in ignorance of, the laws of physiological righteousness. Such ills and pains constitute a most pathetic appeal to remove the evils which cause them. They can be removed, for science tells us that few, if any, diseases are really inherited; as if nature mercifully makes a fresh start with each child born into the world.

There would be less complaint and arraignment of the wisdom and love of God, if all innocent victims of chronic and incurable disease could be led to discern that they belong to the noble army of martyrs who are suffering because of evils in the world, which can and ought to be removed. Even when the burdens are unwillingly borne, as when Simon of Cyrene was forced to carry the cross of Jesus Christ, the testimony is still of value; but it is ennobled and emphasized when the pain is accepted bravely and cheerfully. It is these stricken ones who bear the burden of the ignorance and iniquity of the human race, and who set the pace of the march of the world's progress, for an army cannot desert its sick and wounded. It

was the perception of this truth which braced and consoled a young clergyman who died recently at the beginning of a most promising career:—

"You sought to be the leader of the host," he wrote, "you chose to be a maker of the road; you would have been a helper or a singer in the throng. It could not be. Your task was nobler yet. You are a burden-bearer of mankind. There is the burden of the race, the burden of its folly and its wrong, its ignorance and its stupid prejudice, its sin, its wilful violation of the law, its innocent transgression of the rule. Some one must carry that—must carry that great sadness and great pain, and weakness, that ineptitude, that care—must carry that others should go free, that mankind should go forward and go up."¹

Jesus, the great Example of vicarious suffering, claims them all as his fellow cross-bearers.

"Who best can drink his cup of woe,
Triumphant over pain,
Who patient bears his cross below—
He follows in his train."

It is part of the message of Christianity, which gives it much of its strange power, that self-sacrifice, the loving acceptance of suffering for the sake of the good it brings to others, is a universal law. God himself does not hold aloof from the sufferings of his creatures. In all their afflictions he is afflicted, and the angel of his presence saves them. He became incarnate in Jesus Christ, to save men from the sin which is the cause, directly or indirectly, of all the pain and sorrow of the world. The willing acceptance by Jesus of a painful and shameful death in order to win men to himself and goodness, is the measure to some extent of that eternal spirit of self-sacrifice in God which has ever been manifested for the good of his creatures. To follow Jesus Christ, therefore, is not simply to believe in him intellectually; it also

¹ Alexis Steyn, *The Outlook*, October 1, 1910.

means the acceptance, in a spirit of loving obedience, of the suffering which is inseparable from the life of those who truly serve their brethren in the highest things. And in suffering so accepted, the relation with God becomes so intimate, there is found in it such a healing and purifying power, such an inner joy and exaltation, that the cross is bravely endured and the shame is despised. In a mysterious way sorrow itself becomes the ground of the highest joys, it is itself turned into joy.¹

It may be objected that much of the pain we see appears to be morally and spiritually fruitless, and even positively harmful, causing increased estrangement from God. "There are chastisements which do not chasten; trials that do not purify, and sorrows that do not elevate; pains and privations that harden the tender heart without softening the stubborn will." This is so. All good things may fail, at least for a time, to accomplish the purpose for which they are intended, pain among them. But apart from the sufferings of those of unsound mind, of which it is very difficult to speak, it is doubtful if it does altogether fail in any case. Souls rebellious at first under misfortune, may in the end submit and make their peace. The publicans and harlots, though there may be no outward change in their lives, because of the unhappiness which attends careers of extortion and impurity, may learn to hate their sins, and so be more ready to turn to goodness and enter the kingdom of heaven, than self-righteous scribes and Pharisees who are strangers to the pains of repentance. Further, the pain which has failed to purify here, may yet purify hereafter. The selfishness of Dives was being burnt away in the fires of his torment, as evidenced by his solicitude for the welfare of his brothers. Let us trust boldly

¹ Hinton, *The Mystery of Pain*.

that somehow good will be the final goal of all ill. As Westcott says, in the next world we may be allowed to see that not one pang of the innumerable woes of men has been fruitless in purifying energy. If pain, at the last, brings such spiritual deliverances and blessing that the sufferer, if the choice were offered, would not willingly lose the painful experience if it meant the return to his old unhappy state of spiritual alienation from God, then pain from this point of view ceases to be an evil, and is a perplexity only to those who demand an answer to the unanswerable question, Could not the same ends be accomplished by other means?

In a brief essay it is impossible to deal other than superficially with the great problems of human suffering, but it is hoped enough has been written to indicate in a general way some of the beneficent uses and results of pain in connection with man's physical, mental, moral, and spiritual development. If a complete answer to all questions were vouchsafed, perhaps pain would lose much of its disciplinary power, for it is a profound remark, that he who would always know before he trusts, who would have from his God a promise before he would expect, is the slayer of his own eternity. However that may be, the Christian does not, in this world, expect the full explanation of all mysteries. There are two fundamental convictions, already mentioned, to which he clings tenaciously, and so finds peace.

The first is found in the teaching of Jesus that our heavenly Father exercises a constant and gracious care over all, extending to the smallest detail of our lives. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and not one of them shall fall to the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are numbered." Those who have been in the depth of despair tell us: "This is the last word that can be said. Noth-

ing can go beyond it, and at times it is only the ground which we feel does not shake under our feet. All life is summed up and due account is taken of it according to its degree. Looking at the masses of humanity drawn this way and that way, the Christian teaching is apt to be forgotten that for each individual soul, there is a vocation as real as if that soul were alone upon the planet."

"One adequate support
For the calamities of mortal life
Exists, one only—an assured belief
That the procession of our fate, however
Sad or disturbed, is ordered by a Being
Of infinite benevolence and power,
Whose everlasting purposes embrace
All accidents, converting them to good."

The other foundation is the conviction that God's one unchangeable purpose in creating and sustaining man is to make him a partaker in his own blessedness, by making him a partaker in his own righteousness, and therefore that all the experiences of life, even the most sorrowful, are educational rather than punitive or probationary, being the means by which we are trained and led to this great consummation. Considering man's lowly origin, his inherited passions and instincts, it can only be through self-renunciation and suffering that the soul can win its true self and with it eternal joy. There is left to us the choice between "the noble pangs of spiritual child-birth, of painful-joyous expansion and growth, and the shameful ache of spiritual death, of dreary contraction and decay."

As the troubles of life sooner or later come to us all, and the way in which they are met by the individual affects his spiritual destiny, the question is very practical: What is the conduct under suffering of those who reject the meaning of pain as offered by Christianity, or find it inadequate?

Some are driven by suffering into active rebellion; they "blaspheme the God of heaven because of their pains." The strain of an attitude of defiance cannot long be borne by the human spirit. The end is madness, as depicted by Shakespeare in the tragedy of King Lear, or death.

Akin to this, though far nobler, is the attitude of those who meet the trials of life bravely and without railing against fate or Providence, but still with a hardening and resistance of the spiritual nature as if assailed by hostile influences, the contrary of that patient and willing acceptance which seeks to find the blessing which may be extracted from all the painful experiences of life. Of a well-known painter who died recently, it is said: "Courageous in an eminent degree, physically, and morally courageous, he fought his maladies as if they had been so many desert wolves or hyaenas; he grappled with them, rebelled against them, and would not be beaten." This attitude of mind is well expressed in the lines of Henley:—

"Out of the night that covers me,
Black as the pit from pole to pole,
I thank whatever gods there be,
For my unconquerable soul.

"In the fell clutch of circumstance,
I have not winced nor cried aloud;
Under the bludgeonings of chance,
My head is bloody but unbowed.

"Beyond this place of wrath and tears
Looms but the horrors of the shade;
And yet the menace of the years
Finds, and shall find me unafraid.

"It matters not how straight the gate,
How charged with punishment the scroll:
I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul."

Few have the strength to maintain this self-reliant attitude to the end, and the most that is gained is a forced and desperate peace.

There is also the attitude of passive rebellion, when a person thinks he has been hardly and unjustly dealt with, and goes through life murmuring, filled with pessimistic discontents and irrational disgust; or there is a sullen, passive acceptance of the ills of life, which may assume the guise of religious resignation, the sufferer feeling and perhaps openly declaring, that as things cannot be helped, there is nothing to do but submit.

“It is easy to see how these and other rebellious attitudes arise. We like our own way, and are vastly pleased with ourselves as long as things go smoothly. But when checks come, — either serious troubles or the petty worries we often feel as keenly, — rebellion is the impulse of the natural man. It often overcomes the best of us in a first assault; and with most of us it is more or less chronic, for there are few who have not brooded over their trials till they are at times more than half persuaded that life is nothing but misery. The grumbling temper they have in common is not only the most profoundly irreligious of all tempers, but the most fatal to reasoning action, and even to healthy thinking. How can truth or reason or healthy action be expected from those whose wills are more or less concerned by rebellion? If the earthquake and the storm have slain their thousands, these rebellious passions have slain their tens of thousands.”¹

Those who bear the crosses of life unwillingly, only add to their burden, and the crosses must still be borne.

There are also the modern Epicureans who seek to avoid all pain, who deliberately shut their eyes to the sight of it, will not hear of it, and try to banish the thought of it from their minds. Their life is spent in the effort to make themselves comfortable with the good things of this world. When care and sorrow do intrude, they find comfort in the pensive

¹ Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God.*

reflections of Omar Khayyam, or they seek to clothe their agnosticism with some of the garments of Christianity. At best, as said long ago, Epicureanism is the philosophy of tranquil and indifferent natures animated by no strong moral enthusiasm. The true secret of happiness is not to escape toil and affliction, but to meet them with the faith that in and through them the destiny of man is fulfilled.

It is evident, without going further, that there is no better philosophy of life than the one furnished by the Christian religion, which faces all the terrible facts of sin and suffering, and yet is not dismayed by them.

"Walk where thou wilt, seek what thou wilt, and thou wilt find no higher way above, no safer way below, than the way of the cross. Dispose and order all things as thou wilt and as thou seest; and thou wilt never find but that thou hast always something to suffer, either willingly or unwillingly, and so thou wilt ever find the cross. Thou canst not escape it, for whithersoever thou goest, thou carriest thyself with thee. But if thou carry thy cross willingly it will carry thee, and bring thee to thy wished-for end. For surely if there had been something better and more useful to the salvation of man than suffering, Christ would certainly have shown it by word and example."

We are told there has been recently a great and steady falling away from the churches, and it appears to be true. As the existence of pain, sorrow, and evil is the cause of much unbelief, perhaps the teaching of the church on these points is not as strong, clear, and helpful as it might be. Strength and joy should be found in religion in spite of all pain, and love should cast out fear. We need to be told more plainly that in the struggle with evil, God is wholly on our side: and there is but one God, there is no other beside him. Certainly in the physical world science knows of no dualism. Its witness is clear and decisive that in the universe, so far as it knows, there is but one power, one plan. It knows of no alien

power to which physical evil can be assigned. As Christians, we believe this one universal power is a personal God; so we must conclude that moral evil is here by his permission, not by compulsion of some second ultimate power. If by God's permission, then as he is wholly good, wise, and loving, evil must be serving some necessary though temporary purpose, and when that is accomplished evil will disappear.

"To know that love alone was the beginning of nature and creature, that nothing but love encompasses the whole universe of things, that the governing hand that over-rules all, the watchful eye that sees through all, is nothing but omniscient and omnipotent love, using an infinity of wisdom to raise all that is fallen in nature, to save every misguided creature from the miserable work of its own hands, and make happiness and glory the perpetual inheritance of all the creation, is a reflection that must be quite ravishing to every intelligent creature that is sensible of it."¹

Surveying the long and tragical course of human history, it strengthens the heart, gives courage and hope, to be told that God has always been sustaining by his holy will and unfailing loving kindness, the tottering footsteps of all mankind in its toilsome ascent towards spiritual goodness.

Further, the church should not leave it to the Christian Scientist alone to proclaim so insistently that the evil of this world, alike in its essence and in all its forms, is not eternal but transitory. Modern social progress is proving that most of the great positive evils of this life are removable, and will, if human affairs continue to improve, be in the end reduced within very narrow limits. Particularly is this true of the woes of poverty and disease, which are almost entirely conquerable by human care and effort.

Again, men are crying out for a more hopeful message with regard to the conquest of evil in the next world. Even there

¹ Law, *The Spirit of Love*.

evil cannot be eternal in the same sense that God and his attributes are eternal. There is the biblical promise that hereafter there shall be no more pain, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away. "I saw not sin," writes a mystic, "for sin is only known by the pain it is cause of. Pain is something for a time, for it purgeth, and maketh us to know ourselves, and to ask for mercy. It is sooth that sin is the cause of all this pain, but all shall be well, and all manner of things shall be well." There is a wonderful Eastern legend, told in one of his sermons by Westcott, the great New Testament exegete and textual critic, of a Buddhist saint who had reached by successive lives of sacrifice the stage next Nirvana. At that point he could by one effort of will obtain for himself eternal and untroubled calm. But when the decision had to be made, he set aside the tempting prize, and chose rather to live again in the world while conflict could bear fruit. "Not till the last soul in every earth and in every hell has found peace," he said, "can I enter into my rest." Is the message of Christianity, particularly to Buddhist and other non-Christian peoples, to be less hopeful and loving? Are we to say that the saving work of Jesus Christ, of him of whom it was said that he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied, is in its spirit less comprehensive and glorious than the desires of a Buddhist saint?

It is not urged that the church should preach a gospel of ease and pleasure, and that it should not dwell on the awful consequences of sin. This is forbidden even by modern psychology, which makes us realize as never before the depths of human personality in which no experience ever completely vanishes, and therefore that forgiveness of sins is one of the greatest and most marvelous boons which God can bestow on mankind. On the contrary, the church in her life and mes-

sage is to be more austere, especially if it is to win the nations of the Orient. Perhaps religion in the West has been too much associated with comfortable living and utilitarian ends, as if material prosperity was the measure of a nation's spiritual greatness. There is said to be anxious searching in these days for some fundamental human relationship so independent of the accidents of life as to be capable of appealing to all men everywhere, inciting them to stronger effort for themselves, and a more spontaneous recognition of the rights of others. The Christian church with its belief in the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, who is the leader and inspirer in the warfare against all evil, ought to provide this relationship. Yet it must be confessed that the influence of the church in politics, business, society, and the home is not so strong and pervasive as it should be. For this the Christian laity is in large measure to blame. The clergy can lay down principles, but in the main it is for the laity to translate these principles into action, in the places where it is most necessary to exhibit them. It is for the laity to fight resolutely and unitedly against the evils encountered by them personally in politics, business, and society. In the Middle Ages a great Christian brotherhood was formed of the lay members of the church, of men belonging to every rank of society from the prince to the peasant; they pursued their usual vocations bound only by the spirit of their order. They were pledged to restore all ill-gotten goods; to be reconciled to those with whom they had quarreled; to devote themselves to the practice of charity; to avoid all unnecessary expenditure; to comfort the sick; to instruct the ignorant; to reclaim the fallen. In fine, they practised all the virtues of the cloister without retiring from the world. In those dark and perilous times, the brotherhood

did a work the value of which historians state it is impossible to overestimate.

It is not suggested that in addition to the numerous existing societies another should be formed on these or similar lines. But if a large number of Christian men — statesmen, politicians, lawyers, doctors, merchants, farmers, mechanics, and others — were pledged to live in simple, unswerving obedience to the spirit of the teaching of Jesus Christ, as indeed most of them are, and at any and every cost eradicate all the evil they could, each of them declaring, — to slightly alter the words of Blake,—

‘I will not cease from mental strife,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem,
God’s holy city in our land,’—

who can doubt there would be a surprising spiritual advance, and much of the evil and misery of the world, of which men now so bitterly complain, would quickly pass away. If it be said that to attempt to live in accord with the principles of Jesus Christ, modern society being what it is, would mean for many financial and social ruin, it only proves the point that without vicarious pain and sacrifice the world cannot be redeemed. The price must be paid. In old time, of those who resisted the evil of their day, some were tortured on the wheel, and refused release in order that they and others might rise to a better life. Others had to face taunts and blows, chains and imprisonment. They were stoned to death, they were tortured, they were sawn asunder, they were put to the sword; they wandered about clothed in the skins of sheep or goats, destitute, persecuted, ill-used,—men, of whom the world was not worthy,—roaming in lonely places, and on the mountains, and in caves and holes in the ground, dying

without seeing the realization of their hopes, but leaving the world better for those who came after them (Heb. xi. 35-40). If we in our day are not willing to incur any risk whatever, at least let it not be said that Christianity itself, as a religion, has failed.

Perhaps we need to realize more fully the nobility of our calling and election. It may be no limitation of the actual omnipotence of God to hold that even he is not able to evolve highly organized physical beings without the long and painful struggle for existence; or to give human beings moral training without allowing the existence of sin and pain. But these are only means to an end. God wills the goodness and happiness of all his children, and as quickly as possible. But with amazing self-restraint he does not interfere with their freedom, although abhorring all evil and ever at war with it. In this warfare he needs our help, for men cannot be saved from evil and pain apart from their own desires and coöperation. We are called upon, therefore, for our own and our brethren's sake, literally to be co-workers with God in this tremendous struggle. If we suffer, he also suffers. Surely that is the teaching of the Christian religion. God became incarnate in Jesus Christ to remove the sin and pain of the world, and it is by his own agony and bloody sweat, and by his own cross and passion that he delivers us. Therefore, the suffering of Christ, the willing endurance of shame, pain, and death to redeem mankind, hallows all suffering and brightens it with a glorious hope.

"As I shall be uplifted on a cross
In darkness of eclipse and angulsh dread,
So shall I lift up in my pierced hands,
Not into dark, but light, — not unto death
But life, — beyond the reach of guilt and grief,
The whole creation."

ARTICLE III.

THE QUESTION OF A REFORM OF ROMANISM.

BY PROFESSOR HENRY C. SHELDON, D.D., WEST NEWTON, MASS.

OCCASIONALLY a Protestant writer is moved to give expression to the optimistic expectation that the Roman Catholic Church is about to experience a salutary transformation through an interior reformation. In some instances the inference is drawn that strenuous opposition to the exorbitant claims of Rome is no longer in demand, inasmuch as the coming reformation will dispose of those claims from the inside. Whether the inference is formally drawn or not, it is likely to be implicitly operative in those who cherish the given expectation. It becomes, therefore, a matter of practical importance to determine whether the record of the Roman Catholic Church in recent times affords grounds for believing that a substantial reformation is imminent. In providing a suitable basis for a verdict on this question, we propose to examine the recent record of the papal communion in four different lines: (1) sentimental devotion; (2) sacramental theory; (3) papal absolutism in the ecclesiastical domain; (4) teaching and practice bearing on the subject of the relation between Church and State.

1. As respects the first of these topics, we shall content ourselves with a very brief discussion. The most significant fact to be emphasized here is the extraordinary industry which was manifested at Roman Catholic headquarters during the latter half of the nineteenth century in promoting the

cult of the Virgin Mary. We make bold to affirm that in no other fifty years, in the whole history of the Church, have papal initiative and practice been so emphatically engaged in promoting that cult. Not only did Pius IX. solemnly decree, as a dogma of the faith, the immaculate conception of the Virgin (1854), but he rivaled, not to say transcended, the most extravagant tributes rendered to her by the idolatrous fancy of the Middle Ages. In the encyclical addressed to the bishops in 1849 relative to the proposed dogma, he indulged in this strain: "You know very well, venerable brethren, that the whole of our confidence is placed in the most holy Virgin, since God has placed in Mary the fulness of all good, that accordingly we may know that if there is any hope in us, if any grace, if any salvation, it redounds to us from her, because such is His will who has willed that we should have everything through Mary." In the decree imposing the dogma, the Pope describes Mary as "the most powerful mediatrix, who ever slew all heresies"; furthermore, as the one "who, bearing a motherly mind toward us, and having in hand the affairs of our salvation, is anxious about the whole human race, and having been made by the Lord queen of heaven and earth and exalted above all the orders of angels and saints, standing at the right hand of her only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, does by her mother's prayers most potently impetrate, and finds what she seeks, and cannot be frustrated." Naturally when the Pope expressed himself in such strains his subordinates took little account of the demands of sober speech. Various bishops referred to Mary as "Co-Redeemer" or "Co-Redemptress"; and one of them, Malou of Bruges, went on to emphasize the essential equality with the eternal Son, implied in such terms, by identifying the Virgin with the "wisdom" which the Lord pos-

sessed in the beginning of his ways. "Mary is presented here," he says, "as the first of creatures. . . . This primogeniture supposes in Mary a superiority in some sort eternal and wholly celestial, which assimilates her to the Son of God. . . . Between Mary and God there is no middle course."¹

Leo XIII. did not fall below the standard sanctioned by Pius IX. in his estimate of the practical reign of Mary as queen of heaven and earth, and surpassed him in the number of the messages which he addressed to Christendom for the express purpose of promoting the Virgin's cult. Encyclical after encyclical was devoted to this end, and occasion was often taken in other messages to fulfil a like purpose. He speaks of Mary as "depositary of our peace with God and dispenser of celestial graces, who has been placed at the highest summit of heavenly power and glory that she might aid mankind on its way of toil and peril toward the eternal city." "We should take refuge," he urges, "in Mary, in her whom the Church rightly and deservedly calls salvation-bringer, helper, and deliverer." "We wish that, constantly and without interruption, recourse should be had to God and to the great Virgin of the Rosary, the strongest aid of Christians, at whose power tremble even the magnates of the abyss." "The most holy Virgin, as she was the bearer of Jesus Christ, is the mother of all Christians whom she bore indeed at Mount Calvary amid the supreme pains of the Redeemer." "As no one can come to the supreme Father except through the Son, so it might almost be said, no one can come to Christ except through the Mother." "All grace [so reads an approved citation] which is communicated to this age has a triple process. For in completest order it is dispensed from

¹ Cited by Stap, *L'immaculée conception*, pp. 210-213.

God to Christ, from Christ to the Virgin, from the Virgin unto us.”¹

Along with this energetic promotion of the cult of the Virgin a special effort was made to exalt her spouse in the sight of the Church. No preceding period has witnessed an equal endeavor to foster devotion to Joseph. Nor have the offices of the saints in general, or of their relics, been subjected in the given period to a depreciatory estimate. Reproducing the language of John of Damascus, Leo XIII. has assured us: “The bodies of the saints are perennial fountains in the Church, from which, like streams of salvation, celestial gifts and all those things of which we stand in special need are poured forth to the Christian peoples.”²

From this stream of papal indoctrination an uplift in the level of Mariolatry throughout Roman Catholic Christendom might very naturally have resulted. Very conspicuous developments in this direction did occur in France, where the religious imagination supplied visions of the immaculate Virgin, and turned Lourdes into a veritable Mecca for the thoughts and hopes of the faithful. To what degree the new impetus to Mariolatry wrought in the less congenial territory of Germany and the English-speaking countries is not easy to determine. Suppose its working not to have been very pronounced in that domain, we still are confronted by the fact that the central authority of the Roman Catholic Church, its “infallible” oracles in the last half of the nineteenth century, transcended the record of any equal period in all Christian history in the measure of encouragement given to the cult of

¹ Ency., Sept. 1, 1883, Aug. 30, 1884; Epist. ad Card. Vicarium Parocchii, Oct. 31, 1886; Encyc., Aug. 15, 1889, Sept. 22, 1891, Sept. 8, 1894.

² Litteræ Apostol. de Inventione Corporis S. Jacobi M., etc., Kal. Nov. 1884.

the Virgin. So far, then, as a true reform would involve demands to banish excesses of Mariolatry — not to speak of extravagances of sentimental devotion in general — signs of the imminence of reform would seem to be emphatically wanting.

2. Our next topic for examination, namely, that of recent phases of Romish teaching on the sacraments, is one quite distinctively demanded by the subject of this essay. Both rational religion in general and the evangelical consciousness in particular are under compulsion to challenge cardinal points in the traditional teaching of Rome on the sacraments. Any substantial reform, therefore, must include amendment of the characteristic sacramental theories. Has any amendment, any real improvement, occurred for the last two or three generations? Has any tendency to amendment appeared which has been permitted to take the least root in Roman soil? Suppose we direct our attention, in the first place, to current estimates of sacramental efficacy. Do these, as put forth by orthodox Roman Catholic theologians, fall in any wise below those of their mediæval predecessors? We have not been able to discover that they do. Dogmatists whose writings are in high repute in official circles declare with united voice that the Christian sacraments, in radical contrast with the sacraments of the Old Testament, confer or effect the grace which they signify. "The sacraments of the old law," says Monsabré, "invited men to ask for the righteousness, the holiness, the life of God; the sacraments of the new law confer directly these gifts. The sacraments of the old law were only directive signs, the sacraments of the new law are efficacious signs."¹ Equivalent statements could be cited from Hurter, Heinrich, Billot, and other eminent

¹ *Exposition du dogme catholique*, vol. xl. pp. 88, 89.

authorities. Indeed, the thoroughly dominant view of sacramental efficacy in the accredited teaching of the Roman Catholic Church of to-day is not a whit below the level of that which at any time has held a representative position in that Church. It is, in fact, more ultra than was that of a number of mediæval scholastics, including Peter Lombard and Duns Scotus.

Proceeding with the review of sacramental teaching, consider, next, the doctrine of the necessity of baptism. As is well known, it has been a long-standing maxim in the papal communion that baptism is in such sense essential that no one can be saved without it unless a compensation in desire, or purpose, or the suffering of martyrdom, is offered for the lack; and the inference has been drawn that, inasmuch as those dying in infancy cannot be regarded as capable of offering any of the given compensations (aside at least from the exceptional event of being slain for cause of religion), they are to be numbered with the lost, — not indeed as being condemned to acute tortures, but as being everlastingly excluded from the Kingdom of heaven. In other words, they are eternally damned, though not in the worst sense. Now what signs has the Roman Catholic Church exhibited, in recent times, of a disposition to abandon this monstrous dogma, this creed of gratuitous damnation, which blots the ethical nature of God in representing him as casting away a vast section of the race just for the lack of the ceremonial application of a physical element? No sign whatever. On the contrary, the development has been rather in the direction of rigorous insistence upon the abhorrent dogma. Formerly an eminent theologian might occasionally be found who was bold enough to suggest that in some way a compensation might be provided for lack of baptism on the part of those dying in

infancy. So argued Cajetan in the sixteenth century, Amort in the eighteenth, and Klee in the first half of the nineteenth century. As late as the concluding part of the nineteenth century, the like position was advocated by Herman Schell. But he died under a cloud as respects his relation to official Romanism, and the connection of his name with the more liberal view of baptism could serve only as the reverse of a recommendation of that view among those covetous of a reputation for orthodoxy. With perfect warrant it can be said that it has become more difficult than ever to break away from the overwhelming consensus against the possibility of the salvation of unbaptized infants. The standard dictionaries of the Roman Catholic faith—German, French, and English—unite in sustaining the rigorous tenet, and the theologians of unquestioned standing, from Perrone to the latest author of a doctrinal treatise, are unequivocally committed to the same tenet. Let us scan the words of a few of the most recent. "Theologians," says Billot, "are unanimously agreed in this: the actual sacrament has been in any time whatsoever an altogether necessary means of salvation to all those who never had the use of reason." "Infants," writes Palmieri, "if they fail of baptism, though they are without fault, nevertheless do not obtain salvation." "The Church," Sasse maintains, "does not pray nor teach the faithful to pray God that he will save infants dying without baptism; since indeed there is no hope or probability of their salvation." "It is of the faith," asserts Russo, "that children dying unbaptized are excluded from eternal life; they will never enjoy the supernatural happiness which the blood of Christ purchased for all; never contemplate face to face the infinite beauty of God; never become citizens of the kingdom

their more fortunate brethren are called to possess.”¹ Such is the heartless strain running through the latest expressions of Roman dogmatism on this theme.

Again, take that feature of the eucharistic dogma which goes under the name of “transubstantiation.” What ameliorations of this capital article of Roman faith have recent developments afforded? This question is already answered for any one who has noticed how minutely the Council of Trent, which is credited of course with infallible authority, has defined the transubstantiation dogma. In the face of its detailed decrees, the most that theologians have been able to accomplish is to furnish by their vain defenses a more complete exposure of the untenable character of the dogma. It is plain to a demonstration that it crucifies reason, as implying that one thing can be turned into another already existing thing, and that a particular substance can be severed from its attributes; in other words, be made to subsist in no particular mode. It runs, furthermore, into plain self-contradiction. Under compulsion of the infallible authority of the Council of Trent, theologians are obliged to join in the anathema against those who maintain that in the sacrament Christ is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really. At the same time, in order to provide against a desecration of Christ’s body, and to meet the demands of admitted facts, they are compelled to deny that it is subject to division, and to affirm that it may be simultaneously in its entirety in any number of places, and simultaneously change its location in any number of different directions. In other words, they are compelled to turn it into a purely notional subject divested of

¹ Billot, *De Ecclesiæ Sacramentis*, vol. 1. p. 255; Palmieri, *Trattatus de Romano Pontifice* (2d ed.), p. 19; Sasse, *Inst. Theol. de Sacramentis*, vol. 1. p. 229; Russo, *The True Religion and its Dogmas*, p. 149.

every characteristic of a concrete body. Now what can be meant by the *real eating* of such a subject? Let him tell who is able to see how a mere idea, or, at most, that which exists in the mode of pure spirit, can be a subject for veritable mastication. So Rome's eucharistic dogma stands in its hard irrationality and essential self-contradiction. Any attempt to modify it is quite certain to be visited with the official malediction. This was illustrated in the case of Antonio Rosmini. Unable, apparently, to construe the possibility that one thing should be changed into another already existing thing, in other words, that one plus one should equal just one, he suggested that it might be better to suppose that the substance of the bread is changed, not literally into the body of Christ, but rather into a kind of heavenly nutriment to that body.¹ His modest suggestion, however, found no favor with ecclesiastical authority, and was formally condemned in the pontificate of Leo XIII.

Once more, in our review of recent sacramental teaching, let us glance at the doctrine of the sacrament of penance, wherein the penitent on certain conditions is absolved by the priest, the absolution as pronounced by him having the form and the character of a judicial sentence. In relation to this doctrine has there been any recent development, which, from the standpoint of evangelical religion, can be counted an improvement? The reply to this question may properly lead us to notice three facts.

In the first place, it is to be observed that the latest Roman Catholic interpretations of the sacrament of penance do not detract in the least from the prerogative of the priest in the forgiveness of sin. They assert uniformly that the absolving

¹ Billia, *Quaranta Proposizione Attribuite ad Antonio Rosmini*, pp. 376 ff.

sentence of the priest is indispensable to the given sacrament, and that apart from this sacrament, received in fact or in desire, there is no possible remission of post-baptismal sins. To be sure, Roman Catholic theologians admit theoretically that perfect contrition may secure remission outside of the sacrament; but what one of them would care to grant that this perfect contrition ever has place in one who knows of the sacrament of penance and yet entertains no purpose to apply for its administration to himself? Taken with its proper adjuncts, the admitted limitation to the necessity of the sacrament is reduced to perfectly insignificant proportions. Russo expresses with substantial correctness the position of present-day Romanism when he says: "Forgiveness cannot be obtained except through the ministerial office of the Church."¹

In the second place, it is to be noticed that as extravagant representations of the office of the priest in the forgiveness of sins as were ever uttered have had place in our own age. Thus Gaume in a widely circulated writing introduces this description: "Suppose that the Redeemer comes down personally and visibly into a church, and takes up His place in a confessional to administer the sacrament of penance, while there is a priest in another at hand. The Son of God says, 'I absolve you,' and the priest on his part says, 'I absolve you'; in both cases alike the penitents are absolved. Thus the priest, as powerful as God, can in a moment snatch a sinner from hell, render him worthy of paradise, and from a slave of the devil make him a child of Abraham. God Himself is bound to hold to the judgment of the priest, to refuse or to grant pardon, according as the priest refuses or grants absolution, provided the penitent is worthy of it [that is, exercises the required penitence]. The sentence of the priest

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 237.

precedes: God only subscribes to it.”¹ Very likely the majority of Roman Catholic theologians would prefer not to effervesce in this style. But it is somewhat significant that the language cited came not from a mediæval zealot, but from the pen of a recent theologian. Nor is it to be overlooked that it is more in its rhetorical gloss than in its substance that it differs from the ordinary deliverances of Roman dogmatists. These carry in common the inference that in the forgiveness of sins God Almighty is obliged to wait on the volition and the act of the priest.

In the third place, it is to be observed that, as respects the conditions imposed upon the penitent in the sacrament of penance, the later development has been in the direction of exalting the efficacy of ecclesiastical mechanism. In the earlier part of the modern era it was treated as an open question whether the inferior form of penitence denominated attrition, and described as springing mainly, if not exclusively, from the fear of hell, was sufficient for remission. Not infrequently denial was entered that it was sufficient, and the deeper form of penitence named contrition was insisted upon as the only safe basis of confidence. But the energetic advocacy of the laxer view among the Jesuits tended to give it a superior momentum, and after its espousal by Liguori in the latter part of the eighteenth century it advanced toward a decided supremacy. Billot, who is understood to occupy a foremost place among the theological advisers of Pius X., asserts the sufficiency of attrition, as being commonly taught with the favor of the Church,² and in the Catholic Dictionary of Addis and Arnold we have the broad statement: “At present the opinion that attrition with the sacrament of penance suffices is uni-

¹ *Catechism of Perseverance*, vol. II. pp. 546, 547.

² *De Ecclesiæ Sacramentis*, vol. II. p. 158.

versally held." As Liguori was at pains to affirm, attrition with the sacrament makes one as good as contrite.¹ In other words, a degree of penitence which cannot avail apart from the sacrament, and did not avail for forgiveness under the Old Testament economy, is entirely adequate with the sacrament. So ecclesiastical mechanism within the bounds of holy Church takes the place, in large part, of interior spiritual conditions.²

The conclusion follows inevitably that a reform in the sacramental teaching of Romanism does not seem to be imminent. In no case have the traditional theories been improved, and in some points the ultra-ceremonial aspect attached to sacramental transactions has gained increased ascendancy.

3. In dealing with the next of the selected topics, or papal absolutism in the ecclesiastical domain, our attention is naturally directed, in the first instance, to the decisions of the Vatican Council of 1869-70. Among these decisions that which proclaims the pope infallible in his own right when he speaks *ex cathedra* on matters of faith and morals has attracted the principal attention. The infallibility decree was indeed of momentous consequence in laying the foundations of papal absolutism. But another decree passed by the Vatican Council, namely, that on the administrative supremacy of the pope, was no less significant. By the terms of the former, the pope cannot be contradicted when he speaks *ex cathedra* on questions of faith and morals. By the terms of the latter the pope cannot be practically withstood when he renders his decisions and issues his commands on any matter whatsoever, since it guarantees to him indivisible and universal sovereignty in the Church, leaving not one shred of

¹Theologia Moralis, lib. vi. tract. iv. n. 440-442.

²For a fuller criticism of the sacramental teaching of Romanism, see the present writer's *Sacerdotalism in the Nineteenth Century*.

coördinate authority to any company of officials or to the whole company of believers. This is asserted as explicitly as possible in the following sentences: "Since by divine right of apostolic primacy the Roman pontiff is placed over the universal Church, we teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that, in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may reopen the judgment of the apostolic see, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review its judgment. Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of Roman pontiffs to an ecumenical council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman pontiff. If, then, any shall say that the Roman pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government spread throughout the world; or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not all the fullness of this supreme power; or that the power which he enjoys is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and all the churches, and over each and all the pastors and the faithful: let him be anathema."¹

Who can imagine a clearer declaration that papal authority is superior to every sort of restriction or co-partnership? In the light of the pope's declared prerogatives his little finger must be pronounced thicker in respect of authority than the whole body of the episcopate. The bishops rank as his creatures, and have just about as much of an independent teaching function as belongs to a phonograph. In short, the Vatican constitution legitimates the extremest type of private

¹ Fourth Session, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church.

judgment conceivable, only it is the private judgment of the pope which is given the whole field.

In interpreting their prerogatives the popes who followed the Vatican Council have not failed to recall the picture of unrestricted monarchy which was put on exhibition by the Council. Thus Leo XIII. spoke of the Roman pontiff as "by divine right set over the Church and subject to the authority and judgment of God alone."¹ "In forming opinions," he asserted, "it is necessary to hold whatever things the Roman pontiffs have delivered or shall deliver, and to profess them openly as often as the case may demand."² Again, he gave his lesson to Christendom in these terms: "As a union of minds requires perfect agreement in one faith, so it requires that wills be entirely subject and obedient to the Church and to the Roman pontiff as to God. . . . Both that which ought to be believed and that which ought to be done the Church by divine right teaches, and in the Church the supreme pontiff. Wherefore the pontiff ought to be able to judge, in accordance with his authority, what the divine oracles contain, what doctrines accord and what disagree with them; and in like manner to show what things are honorable, what are base."³ The unmistakable import of these declarations is that the pope is the sole arbiter of faith and conduct alike, the one oracle that is able to speak with an absolutely decisive voice.

The autocratic régime which reduced the clergy to an instrumental position naturally could not concede to the laity any real part in the government of the Church. Accordingly the plea of the Modernists for an enlargement of the sphere of lay influence and control in the ecclesiastical domain has earned the stern reprobation of the pope. Pius X. in the en-

¹ *Allocutio ad Cardinales*, June 1, 1888.

² *Encyc. Immortale Dei*, Nov. 1, 1885.

³ *Encyc. de Præcipuis Civium Christianorum Officiis*, Jan. 10, 1890.

cyclical "Pascendi" (Sept. 8, 1907) enumerated among the offenses of the Modernists their claim that a share in the government of the Church should be given to the lower clergy and even to the laity. In the same encyclical he directed that, in any conventions of priests which might be permitted to assemble, no liberty should be granted to broach anything savoring of laicism or presbyterianism. How absolutely foreign to his thought is the notion of granting any share in governing functions to the laity was made manifest in the encyclical "Vehementer Nos" (Feb. 11, 1906). "The Church," he says in this communication, "is essentially an unequal society, that is, a society comprising two categories of persons, the pastors and the flocks, those who occupy a rank in the different degrees of the hierarchy and the multitude of the faithful. So distinct are these categories that, with the pastoral body only rests the necessary right and authority for promoting the end of that society and directing all its members towards its ends; the one duty of the multitude is to allow themselves to be led, and, like a docile flock, to follow the pastors."

A concentrated all-dominating authority at Rome could hardly fail to be jealous for the sole right of the Roman model. Papal autocracy, therefore, was true to its instincts and demands in smiting the principle of accommodation to national diversities, which was advocated for a period by Archbishop Ireland, and has been christened "Americanism." Leo XIII., in an apostolical letter bearing date of January 22, 1899, passed judgment against it in these terms: "We cannot approve the opinions which some comprise under the head of Americanism. . . . It raises the suspicion that there are some among you who can conceive of and desire a Church in America different from that which is in the rest of the world. One

in the unity of doctrine as in the unity of government, such is the Catholic Church, and, since God has established its centre and foundation in the chair of Peter, one which is rightly called Roman, for where Peter is there is the Church."

The intrinsic tendency of the absolutist theories of the papacy to ultimate in an unsparing intellectual despotism, intolerant of all diversity and free movement, has been signally illustrated in the pontificate of Pius X. Being personally a man of kindly and upright intention, he exhibits all the more unequivocally the logic of the papal autocracy in the drastic measures which have marked his administration. In rating these measures it is not necessary to assume that the Pope had no occasion to criticize and to oppose the Modernist movement. It may be granted that in its more ultra phases it incorporated dubious tendencies. But observe how the pontiff, with the scantiest regard for distinctions among Modernists, sought to destroy them root and branch by deploying against them the most formidable enginery at his command. In the encyclical "Pascendi" he ordered that those in any wise infected with Modernism, or taking an apologetic attitude toward it, or showing a zest for novelty, whether in historical, archæological, or biblical matters, should be kept out of all offices of rule and instruction, or, if already installed in such, should be removed. In the same encyclical the bishops were enjoined to ban all books savoring of Modernism, and to appoint in their several dioceses a council or vigilance committee which should be under obligation to meet their episcopal head each alternate month and to serve as a board of inquisition against the intrusion of Modernist teachings. Not satisfied with these measures, the Pope at a later date issued the demand that the professors in the seminaries should submit in advance the text to be used by them in teaching, and be sub-

ject also during the school year to examination as respects the soundness of their instruction. Furthermore, they were required, together with all candidates for major orders, parish priests, and other specified classes, to take the following oath: "I firmly hold and accept each and every definition of the unerring teaching of the Church, with all she has declared, but especially those points of doctrine which expressly combat the errors of our time. I further with all due reverence submit and with my whole mind adhere to all the condemnations, declarations and directions contained in the encyclical letter *Pascendi* and in the decree *Lamentabili*, particularly regarding what is called the history of dogma."¹ In order to measure properly the breadth of despotic requisition contained in this oath, it should be noted that the decree "*Lamentabili*" condemns sixty-five propositions, and that more than one of its censures smites judicial scholarship in the face.

Quite akin to the pontifical measures just enumerated, in its bearing on intellectual freedom, is the order issued by Pius X. for enforcing acceptance to the decisions of the Biblical Commission, which from time to time publishes a deliverance on some problem of biblical criticism. The Pope's order runs as follows: "We do declare and decree that all are bound in conscience to submit to the decisions of the Biblical Commission relating to doctrine, which have been given in the past and which shall be given in the future, in the same way as to the decisions of the Roman Congregations approved by the pontiff, nor can those escape the note of temerity, and consequently of grave sin, who in speech and writing contradict such decisions."² When it is remembered that the Biblical Commission is a little coterie of theologians in Rome

¹ *Motu Proprio*, Sept. 1, 1910.

² *Ibid.*, Nov. 18, 1907.

who have given no particular demonstration of their right to silence the scholarship of the world, the above requisition affords a glimpse of despotic arbitrariness that it is difficult to characterize in sober terms. Nor does it modify one's estimate of the demand to follow the decisions of the Biblical Commission, under pain of being counted guilty of grave sin, to note that the addition of the Pope's name to a decision rendered by the Commission only gives it the sanction of a man whose biblical learning was such as to permit him to utter this strange sentence: "The Hebrew Patriarchs were acquainted with the doctrine of the immaculate conception, and found consolation in thinking of Mary in the critical moments of their lives."¹

That the representatives of papal absolution should feel deep indignation against any and all who have wrought to abridge the field of their sovereignty is quite explicable. It is no matter for surprise, therefore, that Pius X. should have been inclined to pass severe judgment upon the Reformers of the sixteenth century. The only ground for astonishment is the full license which he gave himself to employ the language of wholesale vituperation in a public document. In the *Borromeo* encyclical (May 26, 1910) he denounces the Reformers as "proud and rebellious men, enemies of the cross of Christ, men of earthly sentiments, whose god is their belly, panderers to the passions of corrupt princes, a crowd of seducers"—language which goes to show that a twentieth-century pope can vie with any of his predecessors in the vocabulary of pontifical fury.

One further manifestation of the temper of papal absolutism calls for mention. We refer to the fact that not one of

¹ Cited, with the original text, in *Letters to Pius X. by a Modernist*, p. 165.

the modern popes has expressed himself in favor of religious freedom, as commonly understood by Protestants and exemplified by most modern States, while the majority of them have explicitly denounced it as illegitimate. Pius IX. claimed for the Church a power of external coercion, and formally condemned the opinion that "in the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship"¹; and instructions rendered by Leo XIII. in more diplomatic style have an equivalent sense.²

Such has been the development along the line of papal absolutism. Who is sharp-sighted enough to see in it all any promise of reform? Surely there is no promise of that sort here, save in the sense in which extra burdens laid on bondmen by the taskmaster are a promise of coming emancipation. A thoroughly Jesuitized platform of absolutist assumptions and irresponsible rule has been in evidence for the last sixty years. That the results have not been fully on a level with those wrought by the papal theocracy in the Middle Ages has been due simply to the fact that the temper of peoples and governments in our age has not been of the mediæval type.

4. An authority boastful of infallible sovereignty over the universal Church would need a well-nigh miraculous gift of humility not to be inclined to arrogate a wide range of control, direct or indirect, over the State. Has the Roman hierarchy, especially as represented in the papacy, given evidence in recent times of possessing this marvelous grace? In answering this question we shall be developing the fourth topic which we proposed to investigate, namely, recent teaching

¹ *Syllabus of Errors*, nos. 24, 77, 78.

² See, among other documents, the encyclical on the Christian Constitution of States, Nov. 1, 1885.

and practice bearing on the relation between Church and State.

That the Roman hierarchy is disinclined to sanction the theory of the mutual independence of Church and State has had abundant demonstration within the bounds of the last generation. Leo XIII. was as explicit as possible on this subject. In a communication where the motive to temporize would certainly have wrought, if temporizing on this matter were regarded as compatible with Roman standards, he took pains to emphasize the necessary union of Church and State. We refer to the encyclical "*Longinque Oceani*," which he addressed to his flock in the United States, January 6, 1895. In this letter, after speaking of the prosperity of the Catholic Church in America, the Pope adds: "Yet though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dis-severed and divorced. The fact that Catholicity with you is in good condition, nay, is even enjoying a prosperous growth, is by all means to be attributed to the fecundity with which God has endowed His Church, in virtue of which, unless men or circumstances interfere, she spontaneously expands and propagates herself; but she would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor and patronage of the public authority." Under conditions less suggestive of the need of restraint, Leo XIII. was ready to use stronger language in reprobating the principle of the separation of Church and State, as appears in the admonition which he addressed to the Emperor of Brazil (July 19, 1889), and in the encyclical "*Immortale Dei*" (Nov. 1, 1885). Pius X. expressed himself with equal clarity and emphasis in the

encyclical "Vehementer Nos." In writing this document, the Pope, it is true, had specially in mind the "law of separation" as put in force by the French government. But the encyclical most obviously transcends the local situation and condemns in principle the separation of Church and State. No other meaning can be attached to these sentences: "The Roman pontiffs have never ceased, as circumstances required, to refute and condemn the doctrine of the separation of the Church and State. . . . If it be true that any Christian State does something which is eminently disastrous and reprehensible in separating itself from the Church, how much more deplorable is that in France."

In a normal carrying out of the close alliance between Church and State, which is thus set forward as an obligatory ideal, the understanding of the Roman hierarchy is that the Church shall be treated as the party possessed of superior right and authority. Writers on canon law, from Phillips at the middle of the last century to Hergenröther at the beginning of the present century, take this position. The former characterizes the clergy as "the ruling Church," the laity as "the Church to be ruled." "A glance," he says, "at the difference between spiritual and worldly sovereignty shows the impossibility of coördination."¹ The latter declares: "In case of conflict between ecclesiastical and civil law the preference is intrinsically due to the ecclesiastical; for the aim of the Church is the higher."² Like maxims have frequently been repeated by recent interpreters of the relation between Church and State. Liberatore, for example, squarely approves the teaching of Boniface VIII. in the bull "Unam Sanctam." "The tribunal of the Church," he affirms, "is higher than

¹ Kirchenrecht, vol. i. p. 283; vol. II. pp. 530 ff.

² Lehrbuch des katholischen Kirchenrechts (2d ed.), p. 68.

that of the civil power. Now, the superior is able to revise the causes of the inferior; but the inferior is in no wise able to revise the causes of the superior."¹ In pregnant sayings of the popes about their own prerogatives the same conception of the preëminence of ecclesiastical authority and of its right to reach over into the civil domain comes to the front. Nothing less is implied in this declaration of Leo XIII.: "It belongs to the pontiff not only to rule the Church, but in general so to order the action of Christian citizens that they may be in suitable accord with the hope of obtaining eternal salvation."² An equivalent lesson is given by Pius X. in presenting as true models "those who obey Christ in His vicar in all that concerns the guidance of souls, or the government of the Church, or that in any way is connected with these objects."³ In the implicit significance of his act in condemning the proposition that "the Roman pontiffs have exceeded the limits of their power and usurped the rights of princes," Pius IX. went at least as far as either of the other two popes in asserting the rights of papal authority in the civil domain.⁴

In practice recent popes have felt debarred from using the full complement of expedients by which mediæval pontiffs enforced their mandates against opposing powers. However, the issuing of sentences of nullification against laws and constitutions of States has been no unheard-of thing in these latter days. Pius IX. resorted to this expression of pontifical sovereignty in a number of instances. A notable example appears in his fulmination against Austrian laws (June 22, 1868), wherein, using the approved theocratic style, he pronounced this sentence: "In virtue of our apostolic authority

¹ *La Chiesa e lo Stato*, pp. 21-25.

² *Encyc. Sapientiæ Christianæ*, Jan. 10, 1890.

³ *Encyc. Communium Rerum*, April 21, 1909.

⁴ *Syllabus of Errors*, No. 23.

we reject and condemn the aforesaid laws, and everything which in them and other matters touching upon the rights of the Church has been enacted, done, or attempted by the Austrian government or by any subordinate officials; we declare in virtue of our authority that these decrees have been and will remain null and empty of all force.”¹ More recently papal sovereignty in the person of Pius X. issued a decree of nullification against prominent features in the new republican constitution of Portugal. “We of our apostolic authority,” writes the Pope, “reprobate, condemn and reject the law separating Church and State in Portugal. . . . We proclaim and announce that whatsoever it contains contrary to the inviolable rights of the Church is null and void and is to be so held.”² In using the words “null and void” in this instance the pontiff went a step beyond the form of censure employed by him against the Law of Separation in France, which he also reprobated and condemned in virtue of the supreme authority confined to him by God.³

In two other instances Pius X. has taken action which trenches quite distinctly upon the civil domain. In the “*Ne temere*” decree (Aug. 2, 1907), which revives the decision passed by the Council of Trent on the requirements of valid marriage, Roman Catholics throughout the world were notified that only marriages solemnized by the parish priest or other specified member of the clergy, in cases where the contracting parties — one or both of them — belong to the Catholic Church, are to be regarded as having any validity, and that this law holds in all regions not specifically exempted from its application by the Holy See. Evidently on the basis

¹ Cited by Von Schulte, *Die Macht der römischen Päpste über Fürsten*, etc. (3d ed. 1896).

² *Encyc. Jandudum*, May 24, 1911.

³ *Encyc. Vehementer*, Nos. Feb. 11, 1906.

of this decree a husband or wife whose marriage has not been solemnized in the prescribed manner can be ecclesiastically justified in repudiating the obligations of the nuptial bond where the civil law pronounces that the given obligations abide intact. Thus a conflict of jurisdictions is invited; and it becomes a matter of some interest to determine how Roman Catholic judges will clear their consciences in upholding the law of the State in face of the consensus of popes and canonists on the superior claims of ecclesiastical law.

The other decree reaching over into the civil domain is the one on clerical immunities (Oct. 9, 1911). This forbids, under pain of excommunication, that Catholics, apart from ecclesiastical permit, should bring suit against members of the clergy and compel them to appear before lay judges. Now such a decree may be a congenial deduction from hierarchical premises. It is utterly foreign, however, to equality in citizenship, and may be emphatically contradictory to the discharge of the solemn duties of citizenship, as providing a cover for iniquity in the very circle where it is least entitled to be condoned, and is likely to be fruitful of the greatest mischief. In any case it abridges the prerogative of the citizen in favor of an exclusive privilege of the ecclesiastic, and in that sense contradicts a principle characteristic of the modern State.

The evidence makes plain that the Roman hierarchy, while restrained by the conditions of the times from giving full force to its claims on the preëminence of ecclesiastical authority and its right to enter the domain of the State, has not to any conspicuous degree abandoned those claims. Probably close investigation would show that, since the settlement effected through the peace of Westphalia in 1648, no popes have more resolutely asserted the superior rights of ecclesi-

astical sovereignty than the last three in the list. On this topic, then, as on other lines of our inquiry, the signs of coming reform would seem to be exceedingly scanty.

It is incumbent upon us to notice such offset to the foregoing exposition as may be supposed to be furnished in the rise and progress of the Modernist movement in the Roman Catholic Church. That movement, gaining admission, as it did, in the face of the mighty bulwarks interposed by the Vatican Council and designed to bar out everything of the sort, furnishes in truth a rather startling suggestion on the practical limitations of ecclesiastical authority. It has a weighty import as indicating that the attempt to isolate the thinking of the Roman Catholic constituency is likely to miscarry in spite of the most formidable expedients that can be devised. But still, so far as any *near prospect* of reformation is concerned, the Modernist movement affords a very unsubstantial ground of anticipation. Fundamental weaknesses attach to the movement. The extremes to which leading representatives have pushed the notion of dogmatic development or continuous doctrinal flux, together with their espousal of very radical conclusions in the field of biblical criticism, have naturally served to intensify reactionary tendencies and to justify a reactionary policy in the sight of a vast majority of zealous adherents to the Roman communion. Then, too, Modernism suffers in point of intellectual prestige by its manifest inconsistency in supposing that the function of normal progress in doctrine must needs be fulfilled within the exclusive domain of the Roman Catholic Church, though its general premises on doctrinal evolution and its specific verdicts in historical criticism are utterly remote from justifying any such supposition. Whatever sympathy one may entertain toward it, on the score of the large amount of reason and

truth to which it gives hospitality, its reformatory vocation must be regarded as subject to most serious limitations. Slight, indeed, is the occasion to imagine that it can cope successfully with a hierarchy which has taken oath to exterminate it to the last fiber, and is armed with full control over official patronage in the entire ecclesiastical domain. It may be urged, it is true, that the anti-Modernist oath was not taken *ex animo* by all the bishops and priests who humbled themselves to the form of acceptance. Undoubtedly this is to be granted. But it is well to be on guard against magnifying its import overmuch. Protestants often make hasty inductions from instances of liberality which have only a very qualified local significance. Because this or that priest, influenced by a special environment, gives expression to rather broad and generous sentiments, and exhibits a degree of fraternity toward non-Catholics, it by no means follows that the Roman Catholic Church is about to surrender its historic claims to sole legitimacy. Were a representative assembly of that Church to be convened to-morrow, the modification of the characteristic Romish assumptions would be the last thing which it would think of accomplishing or even of considering. One can hardly conceive of the scorn with which the Roman episcopate, as a whole, when gathered in solemn council, would repudiate a proposition to admit any other communion to anything like a parity with the Roman. The claim to pre-eminence and exclusive right is held with desperate tenacity, and will not be relinquished so long as the prestige of great numbers conserves to it any respectability.

An aspect of tragedy pertains to the exigency which is upon the Roman Catholic Church. Having staked all upon the infallibility of its dogmatic authority, it cannot revise the approved system without destroying the cornerstone of the

structure. On the other hand, if it refuses all modification, and keeps on asserting its arrogant pretensions, it will be certain to repulse great numbers, with the likelihood that a large proportion of them will be driven into radical infidelity. A program of despotic enchainment of the human mind cannot be carried through in the coming age without most serious drawbacks. The retribution which in the divine order is appointed to truth-defying pretentious authority will arrive in its own time and manner.

ARTICLE IV.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN: A STUDY.¹

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE NYE BOARDMAN, D.D.,
NEW YORK CITY.

ONE of the most interesting characters in English history is John Henry Newman. That we may understand his ideas, his aims, and his work, it is necessary to take into view the state of England in his day — both its political and its theological condition. In the second quarter of the nineteenth century the country was in a ferment. The Reform Bill was passed by the British Parliament in 1832. The Bill was the result of an agitation that amounted to a revolution. It marks an advanced step in the recognition of popular rights, like the establishing of Magna Charta, the deposition of Charles I., the introduction of the era of toleration. Rotten boroughs were suppressed, one hundred forty-three boroughs lost their representatives, the large manufacturing towns were allowed additional representatives in Parliament, popular franchise was extended, the powers of the nobility were curtailed. The established church was severely criticized: its prerogatives seemed to be in danger. A spirit of worldliness pervaded the nation. Thrift, economy, a philosophy of utility, absorbed the attention of politicians and very much that of students and philosophers. To a timid aristocracy the foundations of civilization seemed to be shaken, and the country threatened with a barbarizing democracy. Beneficed clergymen stood aghast,

¹ Read before the Rutland Association of Ministers, Rutland, Vermont, June 6, 1911.

horror-struck. The forces of evil seemed to them to be taking possession of the land. Ten bishoprics in Ireland had been suppressed, English endowments were threatened. Church rites and ordinances were profanely assailed, strict churchmen felt that the drift of sentiment was carrying the populace directly into atheism. The terms "Whig" and "Liberal" were considered infidel, if not satanic. The most alarming thing was, that some of the dignitaries of the church had come to undervalue their high calling, had forgotten the ancient, apostolic, sacred source of their ecclesiastical faith and polity.

In connection with this political and theological agitation many noted names appeared — Peel, Russell Brougham, among statesmen; Arnold, Whately, and especially Pusey, Keble, Froude, Newman, among churchmen. As opposed to the tendencies of the times the most marked theological movement was known as the Oxford Movement, often popularly styled Tractarianism, also Puseyism. Newman was the person who most prominently gave character to its operations.

I. NEWMAN'S PERSONALITY.

His intellectual superiority, his power of subtile discrimination, his capacity for leadership, his boldness in displaying his views before the world, his readiness to accept consequences, the abiding impression from his astounding utterances, combined to render him a unique personage, the object of a curiosity that lasts to the present day.

He was not characteristically English, though he was thoroughly absorbed in English interests. On the father's side he was of Dutch descent, farther back of Hebrew, it was said. His mother was of Huguenot origin — French and Protestant. One of Newman's biographers speaks of the father as an

admirer of Franklin, an enthusiastic reader of Shakespeare, with a "talent for music, calculation and business, of untiring energy, legal acumen, dislike of speculative metaphysics." These qualities, the biographer thinks, were conspicuous in the son. He quotes from an acquaintance of Newman the following description: "His appearance was striking, he was above the middle height, slight and spare. His head was large, his face remarkably like that of Julius Cæsar. The forehead, the shape of the ear and the nose were almost the same. The lines of the mouth were very peculiar and I should say exactly the same. I have often thought of the resemblance and believe that it extended to the temperament."

Considered by the years, his life divides itself into two almost equal parts: from infancy to 1845 (forty-four years) he was in connection with the Anglican Church; for the remainder of his life (forty-five years) he was in connection with the Roman Catholic Church. The events that interest us occurred mainly in the first period.

He was born February 21, 1801. From the first he was under strictly religious training. In childhood he delighted in reading the Bible and Scott's Commentaries. When he was seven years old he attended school at Esling, where two hundred boys were gathered. At the age of fifteen he manifested his reverence for antiquity by the pleasure he found in reading the Fathers. He entered Trinity College, Oxford, in 1816, won a scholarship in 1818, received his degree in 1820. He was not specially eminent as a scholar (once failed at an examination), but still was elected to a fellowship in Oriel in 1823, and in 1824 Vice-Principal of St. Albans Hall, where he was associated with Whately. He was appointed tutor at Oriel in 1826. This position he resigned in 1832 because of differences with the provost on questions of dis-

cipline. From 1828 to 1843 he was Vicar of St. Mary's, an Oxford church, and was University preacher in 1831-32. An event which seems to have made a profound impression upon him was a Mediterranean voyage extending from December, 1832, to July, 1833. He had as a companion Richard Hurrell Froude, for whose health the trip was undertaken. Froude was an ardent churchman, considered Protestantism a gross sin, and held views akin to those of Rome. The historic scenes which Newman visited and the sentiments of his companion produced a lasting effect upon his character. He formed other churchly friendships, as with Pusey and Keble. The poem "The Christian Year," by the latter, he greatly admired.

Newman's intellect is a study: we might almost apply to it the words "unknown yet well known." The popular estimate of his mental powers is pretty distinct. A close study of the man has elicited some curious questions. While he matured late he gave early promise of a brilliant, certainly a marked future. He was vivacious and imaginative rather than contemplative. As would be expected, he wrote verses from boyhood. A biographer reports that "in his early productions are touches, brief yet noticeable, that suggest an experience of doubt, conflict, terror and remorse." In his Mediterranean voyage of six months he committed to paper no less than eighty-five poems, among them the hymn "Lead, Kindly Light." His work as a literary man, however, was not to be of this kind. He was not a metaphysician, "cared nothing for Kant or Coleridge," but was a man of perception, specially of imagination, considered the feelings as well as the reason a source of knowledge, was naturally of a spiritualizing tendency, could carry on his speculations as if there were no material existence. He did not claim to be an origi-

inal thinker, but put to service such thoughts and suggestions as might come to him. He is, however, recognized as the most powerful intellect of his time. In his own day he had the reputation of being the keenest of controversialists. His expostulations with Sir Robert Peel are still considered masterly; his replies to Gladstone, it is thought, do not fall below the contentions of his opponent. Canon Kingsley he addresses rather imperiously. His command of language is considered unsurpassed. This popular judgment is perhaps to be accepted; yet the style, to be praised for its clearness and condensation, seems to me to lack somewhat the spontaneity of confident and inspired thought. He is known to have corrected and recorrected his various compositions. The last chapter of the "Grammar of Assent" is said to have been written eight times. Some essays, or parts of essays, are said to have been rewritten twenty times.

The traits that have now been noticed are of the ordinary kind, though extraordinary in energy; but he had other traits, peculiar, not easily described, not easily apprehended. He seems to have been possessed of a second, an inner self. His prevailing convictions were frankly, openly uttered; while his private meditations ultimately produced surprising modifications in his conduct. There were contradictory estimates of his character. Gladstone when an undergraduate at Oxford heard him preach at St. Mary's, and supposed he was a Low Churchman. A careful and admiring biographer says that he could never have been so classed. As seen at a distance he seems to have been an almost superstitious believer, yet for years he was widely believed to be a skeptic. He combated what he supposed to be the most obvious errors and advocated openly the clearest truths; yet friends and foes alike ascribed to him an innate subtlety of intellect. It was felt that his

speculations at times ran along lines not easily traceable. He was possessed of a magnetism that fascinated the young and rising scholars of his time; yet he never had a trustful following and on the whole lived a lonely life. The terms "sweet," "gentle," and "winning" were continually applied to him; yet all commentators of his works speak of his habit of indulging in irony and of his power of sarcasm. Though he advocated prudence and reserve in the teaching of religious truths, accepting as an often appropriate text, "Neither cast ye your pearls before swine," no one now doubts that he earnestly sought to disclose the truth and nothing but the truth — perhaps, at times, not the whole truth. But he was harshly judged in his day. Though he renounced position and emolument in scrupulous regard for honesty, he was accused of justifying deception, falsehood, and actual lying. Early he opposed the Roman Catholic Church, and heartily embraced the Anglican doctrines; yet finally rejected Anglicanism as heretical, and entered the Catholic as the only true church. This he did openly, humbly confessing his errors and mistakes. Still, even old friends accused him of being a sly intriguer and a traitor.

All these contrarities of sentiment and impression are to be attributed, as it seems to me, not to malice, not to weakness, but to the twofold structure of his mind.

II. NEWMAN'S WORK.

1. *As Restorer of Old Ideals.* He sought by conversation, by discussions, by review articles, by sermons, by tracts (for he originated the Tractarian Movement), to mold popular opinion, and bring it into accord with what he considered the inherited glories of England. He with kindred minds of deep religious sentiment considered that the church was the

power by which the evils of the day were to be overcome. Newman when absent from home, longing to return to his own land, with forebodings of coming trouble, sobbing violently, said that he had a great work to do in England. He referred to a resuscitation of ecclesiastical forces. He and his coadjutors looked upon the church as an institution with inherent powers, not to be molded or modified by the state. It was to them the embodiment of certain truths to be permanently maintained. He was accustomed to say, The first thing is a principle of dogma. With him dogma was the fundamental principle of religion. He said he knew no other religion. His words were: "Religion as a mere sentiment is to me a dream and a mockery." Later, referring to his work, he said, "My battle was with liberalism. By liberalism I mean the antidogmatic principle and its development." He saw in religion an abiding reality. "Faith alone lengthens a man's existence and makes him in his own feelings live in the future and in the past." In his view this permanence and power of the church is due to its divine foundation. Jesus Christ has established it, and given to his apostles the office of continuing it with its original prerogatives. Through the apostles and their successors, duly consecrated bishops, is communicated the divine grace that is its life. The church grows by absorbing and nourishing those who become sons of God, partakers, by baptism, of the divine nature. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is fundamental in the Christian system, according to these theologians. There is no other way of entering the church. Dr. Pusey, the most distinguished personage of Oxford in that day, wrote Tract No. 67 (of "Tracts for the Times") to set forth anew this doctrine. He says that in the early church no organization from Britain to India hesitated at all to accept this view. They

held that men become Christians by being born of God. This birth is through baptism — by water and the Spirit — and Christian life is nothing else than the life and growth of this new creature. The doctrine is not that the simple application of water renews the soul, but that by divine ordinance the Spirit imparts the divine nature to the one to whom the sacrament is properly administered. When the ordinance is administered, all past sin is forgiven, and the recipient enters on the life of the spirit as the new-born child enters on the life of the flesh. 'Hence there is no other Christian life than the baptismal, and no salvation out of the church. (These last statements are to be taken as ideal, and in many cases, perhaps generally, allowed to be susceptible of modification.) It was the conviction of men like Newman that the great need of England in the nineteenth century was a sense of the solidity of the church, a recognition of its sacred prerogatives. The demand was thought to be urgent. Certain bishoprics had been suppressed by the government, warnings had been thrown out to the established church; and, what seemed to Newman utterly intolerable, the government, with the assent of the Archbishop, had established a Jerusalem bishopric which was to take under its charge in certain regions of the East, on equal terms, Episcopalians and members of other religious denominations. In opposition to such public acts certain devout churchmen set themselves to inculcate upon their generation the true idea of a church, a church with inherent authority, developing itself from internal forces. They held that it is based on the incarnation of Jesus Christ. It is empowered to administer the sacraments, and through these the incarnation of Christ is continued. Baptism is a regenerating ordinance because a present divine person, Christ, through the Holy Spirit, renews the one who receives

it, infuses into him a new life. The Eucharist is effective by the real presence of the Son of God in its administration. Hence the church is the church of the living God. The reformers of the time of which we speak undertook to popularize this idea by issuing certain doctrinal tracts called "Tracts for the Times." Forty-six were sent forth in the first two years. In addition, translations of the Church Fathers were undertaken, and an Anglo-Catholic library was gathered.

2. *As a Preacher.* The more personal work of Newman is to be noticed. He was a great preacher. He became vicar of St. Mary's, an Oxford church, in 1828, and remained in that position fifteen years. He resigned his position in 1843, but after 1841 was not happy in it. At first he discharged the duties of his office with much enjoyment. He says that his new occupation seemed like spring after winter. His life was one of free action; his tongue was loosed. He was not yet under the stress that he afterwards felt; but he was earnest, and his power was a personal joy. His reputation filled the city: undergraduates came to hear him, strangers attended St. Mary's. It was felt that he had struck a new mine of religious thought, that the depths of practical religion and vital theology were opened to his hearers. Then he was elegant in manner, possessed a melodious voice that readily adapted itself to the thought of the discourse. His power, however, was not in the delivery of his sermons but in the thought. The subjects of his discourses were akin, often with subtle connections, to the discussions of the day. A delicate melancholy frequently pervaded them, a pathetic lament over our human lot, over the frivolity and worldliness of social life. Coupled with these themes was a tender presentation of the redemptive work of our Lord, while a pro-

found awe hovered over the doctrine of the new birth of our humanity. His style of preaching may be illustrated by a single quotation, introduced by his biographer Hutton with this comment: "The extraordinary wealth of detail with which Newman conceives and realizes the various sins and miseries of the human lot has perhaps never been illustrated in all his writings with so much force as in the wonderful sixteenth sermon on 'The Mental Sufferings of our Lord in his Passion'—a sermon before which even the richness and wealth of Jeremy Taylor's imagination looks poor in comparison."

The biographer quotes the following description of the Lord's bearing the sins of the human race:—

"It is the long history of a world, and God alone can bear the load of it. Hopes blighted, vows broken, lights quenched, warnings scorned, opportunities lost, the innocent betrayed, the young hardened, the penitent relapsing, the just overcome, the aged falling, the sophistry of mischief, the wilfulness of passion, the obstinacy of pride, the tyranny of habit, the canker of remorse, the wasting fever of care, the anguish of shame, the pining of disappointment, the sickness of despair; such cruel, such pitiable spectacles, such heart-rending, revolting, detestable, maddening scenes; nay, the haggard faces, the convulsed lips, the flushed cheek, the dark brow of the willing victims of rebellion, they are all before Him now, they are upon Him and in Him. They are with Him instead of that ineffable peace which has inhabited His soul since the moment of His conception. They are upon Him, they are all but His own. He cries to His Father as if He were the criminal, not the victim. His agony takes the form of guilt and compunction. He is doing penance, He is making confession, He is exercising contrition with a reality and a virtue infinitely greater than that of all saints and penitents together, for He is the One Victim for us all, the sole Satisfaction, the real Penitent, all but the real sinner."

This passage is based certainly on the doctrine of vicarious suffering; but we overlook the logic in the almost blinding vision of the suffering itself.

3. *As a Tractarian.* The "Tracts for the Times" have already been alluded to. Their import and effect cannot pass unnoticed. They were the means by which the great work, tearfully foretold on his voyage with Froude, was undertaken. He with certain kindred spirits to whom, as a friendly critic says, "Religion was a most serious and awful thing," undertook to enlighten the people of England in true Christian doctrine and to correct public religious opinion. For this purpose they sent out a series of pamphlets, mostly small, popular in form, adapted to meet the questionings of the day and to impress the fact that some important truths had been forgotten. The initial movement was considered to be a sermon, preached July 14, 1833, by Keble, on "National Apostasy." The first three tracts were published in the following September. Most of the tracts were written by Newman; but Dr. Pusey, already a professor of high reputation, was looked upon as the official chief of the movement. In the first tract the author says: "I fear we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built — our Apostolical Descent." The aim of these writers was to effect a second reformation, not by a return to the sixteenth century, but to the seventeenth; not to the Protestantism of Luther and Calvin, but to the hierarchical sentiments of Laud. R. W. Church says: "Mr. Newman's deep conviction and fiery enthusiasm gave the tracts their first stamp. That great man's extraordinary genius drew all those within his sphere, like a magnet, to attach themselves to him and to his doctrine. What we may call his mesmeric influence acted not only on his Tractarian adherents, but even in some degree on outsiders." As time went on, these reformers were concentrated more and more into a clique by themselves. During the eight years in which the tracts were issued, ninety in number, it was in-

creasingly obvious that they were not only opposing the liberalism of the day, but were making aggressions upon the accepted views of the Church of England itself. Moreover, this inner circle of churchmen was not a unit. There were differences of opinion and of aim within the body. It was the desire, not to say the ambition, of some, especially of Newman, to show that the Anglican Church was not only apostolic but all-embracing, in fact catholic. Without attempting to give details it will be sufficient to point out the highest aim, the final effort, of Tractarianism as it is shown in Tract No. 90. This was written by Newman and closed the series; indeed, wakened such an opposition that a large part of the Anglicans themselves frowned upon the whole scheme.

The object of this particular tract was to show that Catholics could subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; that the Articles admit of such an interpretation that a Catholic can accept them with a good conscience. The argument is, The Articles were adopted under Edward VI., but had been prepared under his father, Henry VIII., and were the instrument of separating the Anglican Church from the Roman Catholic. Newman says: "Their framers constructed them in such a way as best to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves." He adds: "If, then, their framers gained their side of the compact in effecting a reception of the Articles, let Catholics have theirs too in retaining their own Catholic interpretation of them."

I quote in substance a succinct account of a few of the interpretations advanced in Tract No. 90. Its drift was to show that the VIth and XXth Articles on Holy Scripture and the authority of the Church were not inconsistent with the Anglo-Catholic idea that the true rule of faith is not in Scrip-

ture alone, but also in apostolic tradition; that Article XI., on justification by faith *only*, did not exclude the doctrine of baptismal justification, and of justification by works as well; that Articles XIX. and XXI., on the Catholic Church and general councils, did not mean that the true Church is not infallible, but that the idea of express supernatural privilege, i.e. that councils properly called shall not err, lies beyond the scope of these Articles, or, at any rate, beside their determination; that Article XXII., on purgatory, pardons, images, relics, and invocation of saints, only condemned the *Romish* doctrine concerning them — not any other doctrine on these subjects, consequently not the Anglo-Catholic; that Article XXV. did not deny that confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction were sacraments, but only that they were not sacraments in the same sense as baptism and the Lord's Supper.

It will be in place to present a little more minutely the argumentation concerning another Article. The twenty-eighth affirms that "transubstantiation is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." Newman says, What is opposed is the shocking doctrine that the body of Christ is not given, taken, and eaten after an heavenly and spiritual manner, but is carnally pressed with the teeth; whereas, the doctrine is, that the only substance thus treated is the bread which we see. He then goes on to argue that there is no objection to the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, because distance and presence are relative terms. To a blind man nothing is present but that which touches him. One who sees is in the presence of a star millions of miles away. Moreover, we do not know the relations of spirit to space and distance. "The body and blood of Christ may

be really literally present in the holy Eucharist, yet not having become present by local passage may still literally, really be on God's right hand; so that, though they be present in deed and truth, it may be impossible, it may be untrue, to say, that they are literally *in* the elements or *about* them, or in the soul of the receiver." "In answer then to the problem *how* Christ comes to us while remaining on high, I answer, Just as much as this, that he comes by the agency of the Holy Ghost *in* and *by* the sacraments."

4. *As a Student of Church History.* Newman gave a great deal of time to the study of history, especially church history. He made himself familiar with the controversies and heresies of the early Christians. In 1830 and the two years following he wrote and published a work on the Arians of the fourth century. He says: "About the middle of June (1839) I began to study and master the history of the Monophysites. . . . It was during this course of reading that for the first time a doubt came upon me of the tenableness of Anglicanism." It was in contemplating the position of the Donatists that he was wholly carried over into the doctrine of catholicity. Augustine's "great words" "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*" rang in his ears and put to flight all attempts to compromise on middle courses. When he was on the border line between England and Rome he wrote his work on the development of doctrine, which has sometimes been called his *magnum opus*. The object of the essay was to remove the obstacles to communion with Rome. He shuts out Protestantism in this way: "Whatever be historical Christianity, it is not Protestantism. If ever there were a safe truth it is this." He cites seven tests of church continuity, and shows, as he thinks, that all of them bear witness to the perpetuity of the Catholic (now Roman Catholic) Church. By an ar-

ray of facts gathered from a multitude of sects, the world over, he argues, in an essay of more than 140,000 words, that there is now one church developed in continuous progress from the Nicene era. He says:—

“On the whole, then, we have reason to say that if there be a form of Christianity at this day distinguished for its careful organization and its consequent power; if it spread over the world; if it is conspicuous for its zealous maintenance of its own creed; if it is intolerant towards what it considers error; if it is engaged in ceaseless war with all other bodies called Christian; if it, and it alone, is called ‘Catholic’ by the world, nay by those very bodies, and if it make much of the title; if it names them heretics, and warns them of coming woe, and calls on them one by one to come over to itself, overlooking every other tie, and if they, on the other hand, call it seducer, harlot, apostate, Antichrist, devil; if, however they differ with one another, they consider it their common enemy; if they strive to unite together against it and cannot; if they are but local; if they continually subdivide, and it remains one; if they fall one after another and make way for new sects and it remains the same; such a form of religion is not unlike the Christianity of the Nicene era.”

This conclusion he draws from the application of the first of the seven tests — “preservation of type or idea.” This work on development has been praised as prophetic, as an anticipation of the Darwinian scheme of philosophy.

III. RESULTANT OF YEARS OF INQUIRY.

1. *Mental Perplexity.* Newman’s struggle to get a firm footing for himself was a painful one. He did find a position of perfect repose, or thought he did, in the Catholic Church. But into that kingdom he entered with much tribulation. He seems for a time like a man trying to stand steady on a single plank floating in troubled waters. His description of himself as on his death-bed is painful enough, but it seems to me that his unhappy situation is more graphically presented in a letter to his sister, Mrs. Mozley, dated

December 22, 1844. She was greatly troubled over his career, and he replied to her inquiries in words that seem to disclose distracting uncertainties concerning his own welfare and that of others. He says:—

“If God gives me certain light, supposing it to be such, this is a reason for me to act. There is one truth, yet it may not please Almighty God to show everyone in the same degree or way what and where it is. I believe our church to be separated from Catholic communion, but still I know very well that all divines, ancient and modern, Roman as well as our own, grant even to a church in schism which has Apostolic succession and the right form of consecrating the sacraments very large privileges. They allow that Baptism has the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the Eucharist the Real Presence. What they deny to such a church is the power of *imparting* these gifts. They say that the grace is locked up though present, and is not fruitful to the souls of individuals. However, they grant that unavoidable ignorance and love are efficacious in removing the bar or obex. They consider all children regenerated who die in infancy, and they allow that the Divine mercy may overflow its own prescribed limits. I am then, how can I be otherwise? far from denying it has been given, is given, to our members, but the question is whether it will be given to one who is not in ignorance, whether it is not his duty, if he would be saved, to act upon knowledge granted to him concerning the state of his church, which acting is not required for salvation in those who have not that knowledge. Our church may be a place of security to another, yet not to me.”

2. *Autobiography—An Explanation.* The volume of Newman's works most widely known is his “Apologia pro Vita Sua.” It was published in a series of magazine articles, then in book form in 1864. It came out in a condensed form in 1865, twenty years after he left the Anglican Church. It had been reported that he at times favored deception and prevarication in addressing the public, and that the Catholic clergy were prone to such practices. He deemed it his duty to defend himself and his associates from such charges, and wrote the autobiography bearing the above title. The con-

Vol. LXIX. No. 276. 6

tents of the volume consist of narratives of his opinions and work from time to time, and so far as is needful for our purpose have already been given, but a glance at the pages of mental progress will be of interest. Before 1833, that is before he was thirty-two years of age, he had imbibed from Whately anti-Erastian views of the church—the doctrine of church independency. From Keble he had accepted the doctrine of the sacraments as fundamental in the constitution of the church. He was profoundly influenced by R. Hurrell Froude, who scorned the maxim, *The Bible, the Bible only*, is the religion of Protestants. From 1833 to 1839 Newman was the leading spirit in the Oxford Movement. At this time he was groping for the true idea of a church, holding the Anglican to be *a* true church, if not *the* true church. He was not then sure where catholicity was to be found. He worked happily these seven years, and considered that 1839 was his culminating year as an Anglican. From 1839 to 1841 he devoted himself to showing that a Romanist could accept the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. His explaining anti-Romanism out of these Articles roused the bitter hostility of his fellow churchmen. From 1841 to 1843 his mind was in turmoil. He proposed to remain in the Anglican Church, but in lay communion, and resigned his position at St. Mary's. From 1843 to 1845 he was, as he expresses it, on his death-bed, that is he was dying to Anglicanism. He was satisfied that his own church was not in the catholic communion, and therefore was not in reality a church. This conviction compelled him to enter the Church of Rome, which he did in 1845.

3. *Argumentative Self-Justification.* Newman has given us a remarkable photograph of his lifelong habits of thought in his work entitled "*Grammar of Assent.*" The book was

published in 1870, twenty-five years after he embraced Romanism. It might be said to be a treatise on the laws of belief. Its special value is in showing that many important beliefs are maintained where strict demonstration is wanting. It points out, in general, the circumstances under which we may say of a proposition, "Yes, that is so." Like Butler's "Analogy," it gives prominence to probability. He says: "A main reason for my writing this Essay on Assent was, as far as I could, to describe the *organum investigandi* which I thought to be the true one." He begins with the assertion that all argumentation starts with an assumption or a first principle which is accepted by faith and appropriated as a firm basis for the process of reasoning. The foundation of an argument is not subject to proof. To establish its validity one must go back to a prior principle which would equally need confirmation. Our assent to a statement is first assent to an object of perception, then we assent to an inference; as, that the sun, seen to rise yesterday, to-day, etc., will rise to-morrow. To assent to a previous assent is a reflex or complex assent, and amounts to a conviction. Simple and reflex assent together make up the complex act of certitude. Many of our most obstinate and reasonable certitudes depend on proof informal and personal, not to be brought under logical rule. He says: "The final judgment on the validity of an inference in concrete matter is committed to the personal action of the ratiocinative faculty, the perfection and virtue of which I have called the Illative Sense." This "illative sense" acutely designates an admitted power of the mind. We are familiar with the terms "common sense," "sense of duty," "æsthetic sense"; but that sense by which we embrace convictions for which we cannot give reasons, has not before, so far as I know, received a name. There

are things which we all believe because of our feelings, though we cannot explain the mental process by which we reach our conclusions. We say, Such a man is honest, Such a one is to be suspected, Such an event is sure to occur, The thing is in the air. Mrs. Stowe was said to teach a theology of the bones. We believe these things simply because the mind begets a conviction of them. But the conviction may be as firm as if it came out at the end of a syllogism. For this subtle sense Newman has given, I think, a happy designation — the Illative Sense.

Newman applies his *organum investigandi* to theology, and justifies his own conclusions in renouncing Anglicanism and adopting Romanism, which was to him catholicity. He demands, as the platform on which he works, in all men a sincere desire to know the truth, a full acceptance of the difference between right and wrong. He demands, also, a belief in a just and holy God. He held that God is known through the conscience as the world is known through our natural senses. Possibly he is known directly, is certainly known by inference. Starting from this basis, he reaches the conclusion that the Catholic Church is the only church. This is the necessary result of a thorough ratiocination. The alternative is atheism or catholicity. Religion rises step by step on investigation, into Christianity, and Christianity must be in the end a catholic religion. Whatever beliefs may be entertained in the process of thought, there can be only one goal. Natural religion is inevitable to the candid mind, and Christianity is its inevitable completion.

“It is conceivable that a man might travel in his religious profession all the way from heathenism to catholicity through Mahometanism, Judaism, Unitarianism, Protestantism, and Anglicanism without any one certitude lost, but with a continual accumulation of truths which claimed from him and elicited from his intellect fresh and fresh certitudes.”

This view falls into accord with Newman's general and comprehensive idea of religion. Religious sentiment is natural to man. God is always kind and gracious, there were prehistoric revelations to men, there was a revelation known in Judaism, the Bible is the product of revelation. Christianity is the completion of preceding teachings from God, and the revealing process is still going on. Not all truths disclosed to men are contained in the Scriptures: there are subsequent revelations that have as great claim upon our faith as the teachings of the inspired Word. God withholds certain doctrines till the world is prepared for them. Newman was not ultramontane in his preferences, was not pleased with some of the decrees of Pius IX.; but, I suppose, accepted papal infallibility and the immaculate conception of the Virgin as of binding force.

IV. LABORS AND EXPERIENCES IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

There had been intimations that his later life was spent in comparative inactivity. His diocesan, Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. M. Mathorne, disposes of the charge in this way:—

“It is difficult to comprehend how, in the face of facts, the notion should ever have arisen that during your Catholic life you have been more occupied with your own thoughts than with the service of religion and the work of the church. If we take no other work into consideration beyond the written productions which your Catholic pen has given to the world, they are enough for the life's labor of another. There are the *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties*, the lectures on Catholicism in England, the great work on the scope and end of University Education, that on the office and work of Universities, the lectures and essays on University subjects and the two volumes of sermons; not to speak of your contributions to the *Atlantis*, which you founded, and to other periodicals; then there are those beautiful offerings to Catholic literature, the lectures on the Turks, Loss and Gain and Callista, and though last not least, the *Apologia*, which is destined to put many ill rumors to rest, and many unprofitable surmises; and yet

all these productions represent but a portion of your labor and that in the second half of your public life."

The Bishop then mentions, among other works, four important institutions with which Newman was connected, to which were attached many appendages and outgrowths, — an oratory, a mission, a university in Ireland, and a school for the education of the higher classes. In addition to these employments he was engaged much in pastoral work, in care for the poor, the enfeebled, the diseased.

A few salient points (and but few are popularly known) of his post-Anglican life are of sufficient interest to receive notice. He left Oxford, forever as he supposed, in 1846, actually for thirty-two years. After an absence of that duration he returned for a visit as a graduate and fellow. In the meantime he saw the place only when he saw the spires as a passing traveler. He spent some months in Oscott in 1846 and in the course of the year visited Rome. He returned from Rome in 1847, commissioned by the Pope to establish an oratory, the oratory of St. Philip Neri, in England. He published in 1849 discourses to mixed congregations, and twelve lectures in 1850. He went to Dublin in 1854 to take an important position in the University, but differed with his colleagues on matters of discipline, as he had when tutor at Oriel, and returned to England in 1858. In 1859 he established a school for Catholics at Erghaston. His controversy with Kingsley occurred in 1864, leading to the writing of the "*Apologia pro Vita Sua*." The controversy with Gladstone was in 1874. In this Catholic period he was prosecuted for libel by a man named Acchilli, and fined one hundred pounds by Justice Coleridge. It is reported (the report seems incredible) that the expense of the trial was fourteen thousand pounds, and that the sum was paid by friends, much of it

collected on the Continent. He visited Rome again in 1879 and was made a cardinal — Cardinal of St. George — by Pope Gregory XIV. He died August 11, 1890.

He does not seem to have been received by the Catholics with open arms. Pope Pius IX., at first friendly, ceased to be cordial. Cardinal Wiseman, a born Catholic, made cardinal nearly thirty years earlier than Newman, did not sustain him at Dublin, where he had need of support. Cardinal Manning, seven years his junior, six years later in passing from Anglicanism to Romanism, a cardinal four years earlier, after a period of friendship became alienated from him. I suspect that Newman's personality and independence of thought were distasteful to the extreme devotees of Rome.

V. PRESENT ESTIMATE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

It will now be granted that the attempt of the Tractarians was well meant, prompted by a devoutly religious spirit; but it must be confessed that they were little aware of the prevailing drift of the age in politics and social morals. They entertained a too nearly idolatrous regard for antiquity. The opposition to their drastic measures and overbearing criticisms was strenuous and bitter. Non-churchmen regarded them with contempt. Churchmen, nearly allied in occupation and thought, turned against them with the natural hostility of alienated friends. Dr. Arnold called the Tractarians "the Oxford Malignants." Men of high station condemned them with sincere disapproval, bishops in their charges alluded to their doctrines as dangerous. Still they had friends, and in these later days the movement is recognized as productive of good results, one that might have been turned to good account. Church, a warm sympathizer, says: "The men of the movement with all their mistakes seem to me the salt of

their generation." I compress his comment on the clergy of the day: In their apathy and self-satisfied ignorance, in their dullness of apprehension and forethought, the Authorities of the University let pass the great opportunity of their time. They settled into a pronounced dislike which allowed itself to acquiesce in the belief that men so well known in Oxford, once so admired and honored, had sunk down to deliberate corrupters of the truth and palterers with their own intellect and consciences.

Tractarianism, in the narrow sense, defeated itself. But this term should not be applied to the entire Oxford Movement. This larger movement, it seems to me, had a good effect upon the Christian world at large. It called attention to the fact that the church is essentially one from age to age, that it abides while dynasties pass away, maintains its position because it is founded on the Rock of Ages. It seems to me that it has also modified the sentiments of the mass of churchmen, at least of many leading minds among them, by impressing on the thinking world the truth that the church is a spiritual force, and that it does not consist in outward forms. Material things may illustrate, they do not constitute, the working energies of the Kingdom of God. I do not think that the many external forms of high ritualism tend to materialism, but, as understood by their adherents, give a wide expression to the truth that the spiritual overmasters and interprets that which is material.

It may be in place to remark that this contest between individualism and a living church is perennial. Seventy-five years ago the question was, Is there a living church, the embodiment of Christ—Christ continued on earth—as a mediator between God and man, or is man his own sole priest to commune unaided with God? Now the question is really

the same, Is there a Christ who is mediator between God and man, whom churchmen suppose to be represented by the church? I suppose the shortest and perfectly correct description of consistent modern liberalism is, that it rejects the doctrine of mediatorship.

ARTICLE V.

"DEUTERONOMY: ITS PLACE IN REVELATION."¹

BY HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., OF LINCOLN'S INN,
BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

THE first feeling that this book arouses is one of hearty congratulation to Mr. J. S. Griffiths, who has at last succeeded where so many of his predecessors have failed; and one is tempted to linger over this, because it is the only pleasant thing that can be said about or in connection with the volume. One conservative writer after another has published books and articles attacking the higher critical theory, only to find that no notice whatever was taken of him by those who had control of the Universities and the technical press. Mr. Griffiths has, however, had a different experience. It appears to have been felt that he could not safely be left unnoticed, and accordingly Dr. McNeile has published the present volume, with a preface by himself and a foreword by Dr. Driver.

The following sentences from the preface are material from the point of view of anybody seeking to estimate the book:—

"Those who are unacquainted with Hebrew, or who lack the time or opportunity to study commentaries, may find it helpful to have before them a simple study of the subject, free, for the most part, from technicalities, and entirely free

¹ *Deuteronomy: Its Place in Revelation.* By A. H. McNelle, D.D., Fellow and Dean of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford. London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1912. 2s. 6d., net.

from novel theories or speculations. The results presented in this little volume are those which have received the assent of the great majority of modern Hebrew scholars. Unfortunately, however, it is still necessary . . . to defend them against some writers who continue to cling, in the face of evidence, to the Mosaic authorship of the book. . . . I owe warm thanks to the Rev. Canon Driver, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, both for contributing a foreword to the volume, and for reading the proofs and making several valuable suggestions."

The following extracts from Dr. Driver's foreword are also germane to our task:—

"I have great pleasure in commending this book to readers interested in the Old Testament. It is the work of a competent and accomplished scholar; it is eminently readable; and though small in size, and unpretentious, it is full of valuable and instructive matter. . . . The grounds for the date assigned to it [Deuteronomy] by modern critics are clearly stated; and the arguments adduced on the other side are shewn, as the result of a careful and patient examination, to be in all cases insufficient, and in some cases to rest upon amazing misconceptions of matters of fact."

I propose to show, that, in point of fact, this book, so far from being the work of an honest scholar, is a deliberate attempt to deceive the public; and that it, in fact, contains statements which Dr. Driver knows to be false and has publicly repudiated. What Dr. McNeile's Hebrew scholarship is worth will appear hereafter. But I desire to say at once that both these men are trading on their positions and reputations, and that they dare not bring proceedings for libel against me because that would necessitate their going into the witness-box and submitting to cross-examination on oath

before an independent tribunal, and they both of them well know that this would be their own ruin and the ruin of the theories that they seek to propagate. No honorable person could regard these men as proper occupants of teaching posts after such an exposure as that would involve.

Exodus xx. 24-26 contains a law relating to altars of earth or unhewn stone. It is followed in Exodus xxi. by a law relating to slaves. It is the custom of a certain class of critics to dub these altars of earth or stone "sanctuaries," and then, forgetting what they really were, to proceed, a few verses later, to pin the ear of the Hebrew slave who desired to remain in captivity to the door or doorpost of such a sanctuary. It is of course absolutely certain that no stone or mound will develop a door or doorpost on being called a sanctuary. What these altars in fact were is shown with the utmost clearness by the historical instances—the patriarchal altars to which these critics are so fond of referring, and the altars erected by Moses, Saul, Elijah, etc. I have explained this over and over again in books and articles, beginning with "Studies in Biblical Law" (pp. 25-27). Dr. Driver has at last appreciated the point, and accordingly, in his edition of Exodus published nearly a year before the date of the preface and foreword, he expressly contradicted the theory that the door of xxi. 6 could be the door of the Sanctuary. On this I wrote as follows: "The 'supposition' to which he alludes in these distant terms is enshrined in his own commentary on Deuteronomy. Why does he now contradict it without assigning any reason? Has he really discovered that a mound or stone will not develop a door or doorpost even if it be called a sanctuary?"¹ I sent a copy of this in proof to Dr.

¹ *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, 1912, pp. 155 f. = *Pentateuchal Studies*, pp. 148 f.

Driver, and he answered in a letter dated December 7, 1911, which is printed on page 157 of the same number of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA: "In my Commentary on Dt., p. 184, I cannot see that I explain the 'door' in Ex. as that of the sanctuary: I say that I think the clause containing the word is ambiguous; but I am not aware that I express any preference for the view that the door is that of the sanctuary." To this I replied in the same number: "The word I selected — 'enshrined' — was intended to cover, and does, I think, in fact cover exactly that interpretation of the Deuteronomy note which you now tell me is the right one. It is the case that when you wrote your Deuteronomy you regarded as possible a view of Ex. xxi. which you now regard as impossible for some reason or reasons which you do not state" (p. 158). It is therefore clear beyond all possibility of doubt that Dr. Driver is perfectly well aware that the door cannot possibly be the door of the sanctuary. I turn to Dr. McNeile's book and transcribe the discussion of the point on pages 63 f.:—

"If a male slave wished to bind himself for life, his master (according to Ex. xxi. 5) was to 'bring him unto God,' *i.e.* to the sanctuary, where God was present, 'and he (*or* one) shall bring him to the door or the door-post and pin his ear to it with an awl.' Deut. xv. 17 has a similar regulation, but omits the reference to the sanctuary. It is in the last degree improbable that the Deuteronomist, who is never weary of insisting on the law of the one sanctuary, should have *assumed* that it was to the sanctuary that the slave would be brought, with nothing to indicate *what* sanctuary. It may be safely inferred, therefore, that in the law in Deuteronomy attendance at the sanctuary is dispensed with altogether. The difference is to be explained by the change of conditions. In Exodus, in the days of local sanctuaries, the ceremony is pub-

lic and official; in Deuteronomy, since the one sanctuary might be far distant, it is private and domestic, and is performed at the master's own house."¹

Now what can be said of the Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, who, well knowing that the whole of this passage is absolute nonsense, resting merely on the inability of Dr. McNeile and those whom he copies to distinguish between a mound and a house after having fuddled themselves by calling them both "sanctuaries," passes this in proof and writes such a commendation of the book? It used not to be the custom of Oxford professors to devote themselves to the deliberate propagation of falsehood among "those who are unacquainted with Hebrew, or who lack time or opportunity to study commentaries." But what of Dr. McNeile himself? When first I read this, I was of opinion that he might possibly be a dupe of Dr. Driver's. I still think it probable that he reposed a misplaced confidence in that professor. But it is impossible to acquit him of blame. In the year 1908 he published a singularly worthless edition of Exodus, in which he duly pinned the ear of the slave to the door or door-post of a "sanctuary." I reviewed the book at some length in the *London Churchman* for November, 1908, and pointed the matter out to him. He has therefore had full warning. Still, I have reason to know that Dr. McNeile is habitually unscholarly and reckless in his work. As will be seen from a reference to the article cited, he had not troubled to read

¹ Dr. McNelle proceeds to point out, quite correctly, that I was wrong in suggesting inadvertently in my *Studies in Biblical Law* (p. 31) that the gates of the camp or its tents would supply doors. I am glad to have this opportunity of correcting the error. The point was taken many years ago by Eerdmans in reviewing the book, and the sentence in question is the only one that the critics have succeeded in demolishing during the years that have elapsed since its publication.

the books in his own bibliography; and it is therefore extremely probable that he was so unwise as to neglect to read the reviews of his own book. This would give ground for a charge of gross carelessness, but not of positive dishonesty; but, unhappily, there are other facts which leave no doubt as to the character of his methods. While, therefore, it is extremely probable that Dr. Driver has played him a disreputable trick in either not reading the proofs that he professed to read or else in deliberately passing what he knew to be false and absurd and had publicly repudiated in his edition of Exodus, Dr. McNeile is not a character on whom sympathy need be wasted. I pass on to prove this.

The confusion between an altar of the type of Exodus xx. and a house, which is due to the way in which the Wellhausenites have fuddled themselves with the word "sanctuary," has of course been responsible for much more than a misunderstanding of the slave laws. I do not propose to go over the ground again here, because I have shown very fully in the sixth chapter of my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" how Wellhausen built up his central theory on the basis of this mistake, and how the whole of his case crumbles away when the facts are examined. Mr. Griffiths has discussed the matter shortly on pages 79-85 of his "Problem of Deuteronomy," following me and giving references to my books for those who might desire a fuller consideration of the subject. Dr. McNeile of course found it necessary to discuss sanctuaries. He therefore had recourse to a most disgraceful attempt to throw dust in the eyes of his readers. On pages 58 ff. of his book, where he has to deal with the subject, he deliberately gives the go-by to the whole of Mr. Griffiths's work on the subject, and proceeds to answer the totally different arguments of Dr. Orr. There can, of course, be no

suggestion that this procedure is honest. "The arguments adduced on the other side are shewn, as the result of a careful and patient examination, to be in all cases insufficient"! The "careful and patient examination" is in this instance nothing more than a deliberate attempt to draw a red herring over the trail by avoiding saying a single word about the arguments adduced. A pretty pair of frauds these English university teachers are!

Naturally Dr. McNeile's consideration of the annual pilgrimages is rendered worthless and misleading by his inability to discriminate between a house and an altar. And yet Mr. Griffiths had pointed out clearly on page 83 of his book that altars are not sanctuaries, and that JE recognizes a House of the Lord.

There is another thoroughly dishonest piece of wilful misrepresentation in connection with the slave laws. In ancient Israel, as in other ancient societies, slavery could arise in many different ways. One of the most important of these was birth. It is of course provided in Exodus xxi. that the children of a slave acquired by purchase would remain the master's if born of his bondwoman. These were Hebrew slaves. Unless manumitted, they and their descendants would remain slaves forever under the provisions of the law. I mention this to show the existence of a class (not the only class) of Hebrew slaves. That this class was large may reasonably be inferred from the various incidental references. Now in most ancient societies another frequent cause of slavery was insolvency. Moses desired to guard against Hebrews losing their freedom permanently owing to this cause, and accordingly provided in Leviticus xxv. 39 ff. that an insolvent Israelite in such case was to serve only till the Jubilee, and was not to be treated as a slave during this period of

service. Here are the words of the law: "And if thy brother be waxen poor with thee, and sell himself unto thee; thou shalt not make him to serve as a bondservant . . . they shall not sell themselves as bondsmen." It is impossible to entertain any doubt as to the class of persons affected by this law, because none but insolvent debtors can be brought within its sweep. The condition is "if he be waxen poor and sell himself." This could not apply to anybody who was already a slave, because a Hebrew slave could neither wax poor nor sell himself in consequence. Mr. Griffiths, following and abbreviating my discussion in "Studies in Biblical Law," duly points this out on pages 71 ff. What has Dr. McNeile to say to this? Not a word. On pages 64 f. he coolly treats this law of Leviticus as relating to Hebrew slaves, and proceeds to build on this assumption which nobody who knew anything about legal construction could uphold and which had been expressly disproved in the book he was purporting to answer. "The arguments adduced on the other side are shewn, as the result of a careful and patient examination, to be in all cases insufficient"!

Of priests and Levites, Dr. McNeile has much to say. It is not my intention to follow him on this subject, because, when I reviewed Mr. Griffiths's book in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for July, 1911, I intimated that I thought this section unsatisfying, and suggested that it might be rewritten in a future edition. My own views are set forth in the article on "Priests and Levites" which first appeared in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for July, 1910, and has now been reprinted in "Pentateuchal Studies."¹ At the same time, attention may be called to two or three points in Dr. McNeile's discussion. On page 122 we are assured that the Levite of Judges xvii. 7 was

¹ See pp. 231-284.

"of the family of Judah." "He was therefore, not a member of the *tribe* of Levi." Of course this is not the case. The person in question was a grandson of Moses in the male line, and consequently a member of the tribe of Levi. The fact is that the Massoretic text does not enjoy the support of either of the two old Greek Versions in making him a member of the tribe of Judah, and his ancestry leaves no doubt that the Massoretic text is wrong. Dr. McNeile's representation of the duties of the Levites in P is also entirely misleading. He alleges that they were to perform certain menial duties, and in a footnote on pages 70 f. he details those duties on the strength of certain passages in Chronicles,—"e.g. cleaning vessels, and the sacred precincts generally; opening the doors daily; looking after all the furniture; personal service to the priests (which might involve almost any servile work); roasting, baking, and boiling food; carrying food to the congregation; killing and flaying sacrificial victims." Yet at the bottom of page 74 he knows that in P the Levites "were in peril of death if they so much as touched the altar or other sacred things." How they were to clean these things without touching them is a mundane question that Dr. McNeile does not condescend to answer. Nor, again, is it true that the Levites in P were to kill and flay the victims, since this duty is expressly assigned to the sacrificant. But it seems to me unnecessary to deal with this matter further at present, as I do not agree with Mr. Griffiths, and Dr. McNeile has not met my totally different arguments and facts. With regard to the question of the Levitical cities I need only refer to my fuller discussion in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for October, 1911, now reprinted in "Pentateuchal Studies."¹

There is, however, a point of mine with which Dr. McNeile

¹ See pp. 299 ff.

does attempt to deal that is closely connected with the subject of priests — I mean firstlings. In this instance Mr. Griffiths has followed me, quoting the short statement of my position on pages 208 f. of my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism." On looking up the reference, I regret to find that I have omitted to add a reference to my fuller discussion of the subject in the London *Churchman* for July and September, 1906. Still, such a reference would have availed nothing against a man who, like Dr. McNeile, was determined to maintain the Wellhausen position *per fas et nefas*; for here resort is had to a most discreditable device. The position is this: A careful legal study of the effects of holiness on animals shows the force of the technical term. Without repeating everything that I have said in the *Churchman* articles, which, however, is essential to a full grasp of the subject, I may quote the following, which was written of the phrase "holy things":—

"As applied to animals — and certain animals appear to have been called 'holy things' *par excellence*, — it denoted especially (but not exclusively) animals that were holy by operation of law, and not by the act of man. Except in cases where some physical blemish rendered them ineligible for purposes of sacrifice, such 'holy things' were to be withdrawn from ordinary use and sacrificed to the Lord. Firstlings were to be brought to the religious center for this sacrifice, but this rule does not apply to tithe animals. The subsequent disposition of their flesh is regulated by the following verses:

"'And every *terumah* of all the holy things of the children of Israel, which they present unto the priest, shall be his.

"'And every man's holy things shall be his: whatsoever any man giveth the priest, it shall be his' (Num. v. 9, 10).

"So we see that the flesh of firstlings remained the owner's,

subject to his giving the priest some contribution — technically called *terumah*. No fixed rule is laid down as to the amount of this contribution. Probably where a number of animals were brought, one or more would be handed over to the priest" (Churchman, 1906, p. 427).

Now Dr. McNeile explains in a footnote on page 82 that *terumah* denotes something *lifted off* a larger mass, and set apart for some sacred purpose. It does not, however, seem to have occurred to him that this means that it is a word of partitive meaning. When we read in Numbers xviii. 19 "the heave-offerings of the holy things," we may with absolute correctness substitute 'the separated portions of the holy things.' This, of course, is what Mr. Griffiths and I hold that the phrase means, and we take the genitive as partitive. To this, Dr. McNeile replies as follows: "But Mr. Griffiths arrives at this conclusion through a misunderstanding of the Hebrew construction. He takes 'the *terumah of* the holy things' to have a partitive meaning, as though the contribution formed only a portion *taken from* the holy things. But this would require [*sic* H. M. W.] the preposition ׀, 'from.' In Num xviii 19 'the contribution of the holy things' means 'the contribution *consisting of* the holy things'; the two words are in apposition as in 'the people *of* Israel,' 'the virgin *of* the daughter of Zion' (Is xxxvii 22), 'the city *of* London.' In Num v 9 (which is clearly explained by ver 10a) the meaning is the same, but instead of the genitival construction the Hebrew has the preposition ׃ as its equivalent" (pp. 83 f.).

It is to be remembered that this book is professedly written for those who know no Hebrew, and that it is the work of a Cambridge don and is commended by the Oxford Regius Professor of Hebrew. That is what makes the matter so serious.

for both men must be quite as well aware as I am that the statement that the partitive meaning would *require* the preposition *pro*, "from," is false. The partitive genitive exists in Hebrew as in English; for example, we read just before (in verse 13): "the first-fruits of everything which is in their land." That does not mean "the first-fruits consisting of everything in their land," though of course the genitive is sometimes used in both Hebrew and English in an appositional sense. Whether the genitive in our passage is appositional or partitive is a question to be determined by other considerations, but there can be no possible excuse for the statement in Dr. McNeile's text.

Some of the considerations relating to the determination of the meaning are rather technical, and in view of the very full discussion in the *Churchman* article I need not enter on them here, but two matters must be shortly dealt with. Numbers v. 9, according to Dr. McNeile, "is clearly explained by ver 10a." I am not at all sure what he means by this, but I think that he wishes it to be understood that 10a and 9 are identical in meaning. It is only necessary to transcribe the passage with the necessary explanatory matter to see how absurd this is: "And every separated portion consisting of all the holy things of the children of Israel which they present to the priest shall be his (the priest's). 10a And every man's holy things shall be his (the priest's); 10b whatsoever any man giveth the priest, it shall be his (the priest's)." I apprehend that it is unnecessary to descant on the tautology and inherent absurdity of this rendering.

The best MS. of the LXX makes the meaning of 10a quite clear when it renders "and to each man shall his holy things belong."

The other point to which I desire to advert in this connec-

tion is the fact that, in a number of places in chapter xviii., the LXX read ἀπὸ, "from," where the Massoretic text has ל. Thus in verse 8 we have "*from* all the things sanctified to me." This is probably the right reading. It is interesting to note how a consideration of the Hebrew text in the light of purely legal methods of construction led me to conclusions that, as I now find, are confirmed in this way by the oldest extant text of the Pentateuch.

Another bad blunder in translation that happens to have some connection with firstlings is made by Dr. McNeile on page 82, where he tries his hand at rendering Exodus xxii. 30 (29). He translates "on the eighth day thou shalt give it to me." It should be "thou *mayest* give it to me." This is a very frequent mistranslation in the English Versions, but I do not think it causes much harm, as a rule. It often happens that a command is given in this form, and immediately followed by a clause prescribing an alternative, and I believe that in such cases English readers recognize that, in spite of the mandatory form of the English, the meaning is permissive. Thus in Exodus xiii. 13 it is generally realized that the law means "thou *mayest* [not "shalt"] redeem," in xx. 24 "*mayest* [not "shalt"] make," and so on.

So much for Dr. McNeile's treatment of the laws. I do not propose to enter into the question of the Style of Deuteronomy, because I treated of it at length in an article that originally appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review* for 1907, and has now been reprinted in the volume of "Pentateuchal Studies."¹ Dr. McNeile makes no attempt to meet what I have said there; so that it is unnecessary to treat further of his chapter on the subject.

As to the alleged discrepancies between the narrative of

¹ See pp. 195-224.

Deuteronomy and the earlier books, these have, for the most part, been discussed at sufficient length in my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" and "Origin of the Pentateuch" and in Mr. Griffiths's volume. Since, moreover, it will presumably be necessary for Mr. Griffiths to answer Dr. McNeile and travel over the ground at full length again, it is unnecessary for me to say much. I never agreed with either Wellhausen or Mr. Griffiths in regard to the stay at Kadesh; indeed, I have shown clearly in my "Essays" that the text of Numbers is not in order. But there is one point to which I ought to refer briefly. Dr. McNeile complains that defenders of the Mosaic authenticity of Deuteronomy do not notice the discrepancies between the two versions of the Ten Commandments. They do not; and the reason for their silence is that they feel the critical argument on this point to rest on so profound an ignorance of the mental habits of human beings, that they really do not know what to say in reply. In the first place, the Nash papyrus and the Septuagintal variations show that it is impossible to feel sure of the exact text, and that some allowance must be made for the vicissitudes of a MS. tradition. But, in the second place, educated men are well aware that the habit of quoting from memory is an old one, and that certainly neither Moses nor any of his contemporaries would have been likely to object to or feel any difficulty about such slight verbal variations as exist between the two versions. It is to be remembered that these do not in the slightest degree affect the sense or the duty of any Israelite. I have never been able to feel any difficulty about the point. On the other hand, Dr. McNeile's suggestion that Moses should have taken the tables of stone out of the Ark and have read them to the people is simply grotesque. Here, as in other passages,

he only shows a total inability to comprehend Hebrew feeling or ways of thought.

Much space is consumed in the effort to prove that, on the critical theory, Deuteronomy is not a forgery. I waste no words on this, because it is obvious that Drs. Driver and McNeile are not true enough themselves to be able to form an opinion on such a subject. When the latter writes, "The acknowledged literary device . . . would deceive no one" (p. 40), he simply ignores the fact that, on his hypothesis, it did in fact deceive every one for twenty-five centuries. To put forward such an allegation a man must be either hopelessly dishonest or an utter imbecile, or both.

From my study of the book I can only say that these two men — Doctors Driver and McNeile — are a disgrace to their Universities and to their cloth. It is deeply to be deplored that men who belong to an honorable profession should have fallen so low.

ARTICLE VI.

NEW METHODS OF INQUIRY CONCERNING THE
PENTATEUCH.¹

BY JOHANNES DAHSE, FREIRACHDORF, GERMANY.

EVERY reader of the Bible is at once impressed, upon reading the book of Genesis, by the many repetitions which pervade the Mosaic writings; he is also impressed by the fact that not only separate verses but also entire parallel accounts repeat what has already been told, and, as a result, are, in their present relation, often very distracting. Because of these repetitions, Old Testament critics have concluded that the five books of Moses are a compilation from different sources. Each of these sources, three of which are thought to have been found in Genesis, has, according to the views commonly accepted until recently, its peculiar designation of the Deity and its special name for the third patriarch, and each points also to other peculiarities, viz. of language and matters of religious history. This source hypothesis has had almost universal acceptance among the students of the Old Testament throughout the whole world. Even to-day the older school of Old Testament critics, with the exception of Klostermann, consider it one of the most important results of scientific research.

The younger generation of scholars, however, are beginning to doubt seriously the correctness of this hypothesis.

¹Translated by Karl Frederick Gelser, Ph.D., Oberlin, Ohio.

Recently there has appeared a long list of writings in which the authors point out its weak points. The worthlessness of the names of the Deity as a source distinction has been pointed out in the *American Journal of Theology* in 1904 by Redpath, in England by Wiener (since 1909),¹ in Holland by Eerdmans (1908), in Germany by Klostermann, Johannes Lepsius (in the *Reich Christi*, 1903), and by myself (in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 1903). Moreover, various Catholic theologians, as Hoberg, Hummelauer, Schlögl, and Weiss, have written appropriate contributions.

That the names "Jacob" and "Israel" are just as worthless for source distinction as the names of the Deity is shown in my "Textkritische Materialien zur Hexateuchfrage" (Gießen, 1912), and by Harold M. Wiener in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* (1910).

According to this view, the main reason for the existence of the records of the Jahvists who wrote "Jehovah" and "Israel" in the manner supposed, and the Elohist's who wrote "Elohim" and "Jacob," are invalid. The condition of things is somewhat different in the documents assigned to "P" (so named because they are said to have originated with priests). One sees at the first glance that, if not all, at least detached parts, of these records seem to stand apart from the rest of Genesis. The question then arises, Was P once an independent document, as is generally accepted, or have these parts of P been incorporated into the remaining parts of Genesis already at hand? Klostermann and Orr support this view. What better methods, then, are there of solving the problem of the five books of Moses than those used hitherto?

De Lagarde has already made this criticism of the meth-

¹ In the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

ods of critical inquiry into the Pentateuch which have been in vogue up to the present time, viz. that they approach the solution of the problem concerning the origin and composition of the five books of Moses from the wrong point of view. Because of a few peculiarities of one edition of the books of Moses (but not valid everywhere without exception), viz. the Hebrew which is called the Massoretic text, they accept the existence of many sources without stopping to consider that we have other editions of these books, and without testing to see if the same peculiarities are found in them as in the usual Hebrew edition. Among other editions we have the Vulgate, which coincides with the Latin translation of Jerome, whose Hebrew source corresponds in the main points, though not everywhere (e.g. in the names of the Deity), with the Massoretic Hebrew text.¹ We have, also, the old Syriac translation, whose Hebrew source shows more deviation from the other Hebrew text than the Vulgate does.

We have, moreover, the Greek translation called the Septuagint, with its contributions by Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius, whereby the existence of four other valuable Hebrew texts is proved. Then we have fragments from other Greek translators — Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, whose Hebrew sources here again deviate in different places from the present Hebrew. Finally, there is the Hebrew text of the Samaritans, with its deviations. Thus we see a scientific inquiry has to deal with more than ten different textual editions of Genesis of which traces are found occasionally in extant Hebrew MSS. These may, however, all claim to be heard as to the origin of the Pentateuch; for who will guarantee that one of the most recent texts — the Massoretic — has preserved the correct

¹ See the valuable remarks of Wiener, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January, April, and October, 1910.

information? Is it not also improbable that we can from this text best recognize the alleged source material?

A few examples may serve to illustrate what as history the text of the Mosaic writings has back of it. What is the name of the first-born son of Jacob? We have all known him by the name of "Ruben." Thus he is called in the present Hebrew text. In addition to this form there appears in many Greek MSS. "Rubem," "Rubim," or "Rubeim," that is, a form in *m*. This form is used by the church fathers Origen and Chrysostom. But the Syriac translation of Genesis, the Jewish author Josephus, and an Ethiopic MS. call him "Rubel," and that seems to be the oldest form of the name.

Again, what is the name of the mountain upon which the Law was delivered to Moses? The Greek translation gives "Sina" and not "Sinai." What is the original order of sequence of the Ten Commandments? To the laity, of course, it is "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt not steal." We need go no farther than the New Testament to find in various places a different order of sequence, which order is also found in the Septuagint, viz. adultery, murder, theft. This order is also cited by the Jew Philo. Codex B, regarded by many as the best MS. of the Septuagint, has, along with other MSS., a different order of sequence, viz. adultery, theft, murder.

Finally, how many sons had Joseph? Every one will answer according to Genesis xlv. 27, "Two, Ephraim and Manasseh." But Genesis xlviii. 6 presupposes a greater number; and, in fact, in the Greek translation of xlv. 27 the number of Joseph's sons is given as nine, not as two. The Hebrew source of the Septuagint corresponds in meaning with the present Hebrew text of Genesis xlviii. 6.

These few examples show how familiar facts get an entirely different meaning when one takes into account all the available materials, and not merely the usual Hebrew text. Is it not then the simple duty of every scientific investigator of the Old Testament to search all available texts in order to distinguish the sources of the five books of Moses? To what results careful investigation of this kind will ultimately lead is shown in my "Textkritische Materialien."

Having, however, established the oldest available text, we are still not in a position to recognize the authoritative sources of Genesis. We still have to consider that the five books of Moses were used in worship in the synagogue. Books, however, which are read in worship, contain not merely the text, but also directions for the reader, chapter headings, indexes, recapitulations, etc. Before me lies an old German Bible (Sulzbach, 1827). I open to Genesis xxviii., and find there this superscription: "Jacob flees towards Haran, sees the ladder to heaven and receives like his fathers the great promises." Now I assume that all was written without interruptions and remarks upon verses, as was customary in the old MSS. Then we shall have here a text with repetitions in which Jacob flees, before verse 1, to Haran, sees the ladder to heaven, and receives the great promises, all of which is told again in detail in verses 10, 11, 12, and 13 ff. Besides this we are reminded in these words, before verse 1, of something which has been already reported concerning the promises which the fathers have received. He who does not know that the words before verse 1 are a superscription can apparently find there traces of a special written source which would have its continuation in the superscription of chapter xxix.: "Jacob serves Laban and receives his two daughters in marriage. His four sons by Leah." Such superscriptions may be recognized by this: they

contain nothing new so far as content is concerned, but point to that which is to happen, and now and then cast a retrospect upon what has already been related. Would it be strange if something similar to what occurs in the present Pentateuch were found in the copy of the Holy Scriptures designed for reading in the synagogues? Let us see. Genesis v. 1-2 gives this impression. It is a recapitulation of chapter i. Genesis vi. 9-12 repeats the contents of Genesis v. 32-vi. 8. Genesis xii. 4 is the superscription to what follows. The same is true, e.g., in xvi. 1-3; xxi. 1a; xxv. 19-20; xxx. 22; xxxi. 3, etc. All these references which in their present arrangement present distracting repetitions give the impression of superscriptions and recapitulations. Most of them belong to the document P. And the remarkable fact is that they occur in exactly those places where the old paragraphs or sections of the synagogue readings begin or end. For particulars, see my "Textkritische Materialien."

The Old Testament critics are right in that they ascribe a recent origin to these passages of P, but they are in error in so far as they consider P an independent writing and anything more than an explanatory aid in conducting worship. They are also in error in holding that the whole of P in Genesis is post-exilic; for, e.g., Genesis xvii. and xxiii. belong to the old history, and they have not noticed that there are many late additions and so-called glosses in the P writings which were not found in the Hebrew source of the Septuagint.¹

When we have purged the texts of glosses and of the supplements designed for use in worship, the question arises, whether traces of perhaps still older editions are to be found. Not until this problem is solved are we able to approach a final working out of the ultimate sources.

¹ See Wiener, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April and October, 1910, and my *Textkritische Materialien*.

The purpose of this short sketch is to show that we are not at the end of Pentateuchal criticism, but at its beginning. As in New Testament criticism, so here, a backward movement has set in, and it is possible that again in the future a greater portion of the Pentateuch than formerly will be ascribed to the time of Moses or to the oldest times of Israel.

ARTICLE VII.

PROBLEMS OF THE PASSION WEEK.

BY DEAN ALFRED MARTIN HAGGARD, DES MOINES, IOWA.¹

"WHAT biblical task would you place before them, if you wished to break down the brightest and best students of all the graduating classes in all the schools of theology of the world for fourteen years in succession?"² I might not find a question which would do this, but I would try them out on the problems of the Passion Week. I know of nothing more intricate — nothing closer to the realm of the hopeless. I say this after some years of special study in this particular field, and after many years of hard work upon the most difficult problems in the Bible.

- In a way as brief and plain and simple as possible, allow me to state the results of my work.

I find that Jesus arose from the dead on a First Day of the week — the day so well known to us as Sunday or the Lord's Day. This first Lord's Day differed from its companions of the present time by having both its beginning and its ending determined by the setting of the sun.³ According to Jewish custom, this was true of all their days till the Roman custom of counting from midnight to midnight began to claim a place.⁴

At what hour of this great day was the stone rolled away? At what hour did Jesus come forth from the tomb? The Gospels clearly and certainly call for an early morning hour.

If the resurrection of our Lord took place between three and four o'clock, we would speak of it as the fourth hour of the day. With the Jews it would have been the tenth hour. I know of no hour which more completely meets the demands of all the facts in the case.

At what hour was the crucified body of our Lord placed in the sepulcher by Joseph and Nicodemus? Since the death upon the cross occurred at or near three o'clock in the afternoon, the hour of interment must be fixed later — enough later to give time for several events mentioned in the records. Since the Sabbath began at or near six o'clock and prevented the Galilean women from taking their part in the embalming of the body, though they did have time for some preparation after their return from the burial; and since the embalming conducted by the men must have taken a little time, the hour of interment must be placed an hour, or the larger part of an hour, before six. The time most probable for the interment was at five o'clock.

How many hours did the grave hold the body of Jesus? According to the late Dr. W. J. Beecher,⁵ the answer should be about thirty-six hours. With very, very few exceptions, the world of biblical scholarship answers by that number. During almost a lifetime, as preacher and teacher, I never dreamed of calling this answer in question. I was, however, forced to abandon it not long since. Some argue stoutly and with great ingenuity for seventy-two hours. This position I find absolutely untenable. If I have considered all the facts, — if I have made their induction with proper care and with scientific precision, — the body lay in the grave between fifty-nine and sixty hours.

The day of crucifixion, therefore, was not Friday but Thursday. The Gospel references to the time in the grave

Vol. LXIX. No. 276. 8

are many and may be classified, forming three types of description. The "three days and three nights" of Matt. xii. 40 is the most exacting type. Thursday, according to a well-known method of Jewish reckoning, satisfies its minutest demands. I have thoroughly examined two very able attempts to show that the crucifixion took place on Wednesday. One of these is so skillfully presented that Dr. R. A. Torrey, of the Moody Bible Institute, has rejected Friday and adopted Wednesday.⁶ To the author of this position, Dr. J. Wilbur Chapman writes: "I greatly appreciate your biblical statements, and while I am not clear as to Wednesday being the day of crucifixion, yet I am intensely interested in all you write." Dr. J. M. Buckley, while editing the New York *Christian Advocate*, spoke of it as "a close argument," and added: "It is really revolutionary, and founded on the most painstaking, careful study." And the editor of the Philadelphia *Episcopal Recorder* says: "We are unable to detect a flaw in his reasoning." Like two or more of these men, I have been compelled to give up Friday; but, unlike them, unlike almost forty others in the same list with them, I find too many flaws to think for a moment of holding for Wednesday crucifixion. If I know how to handle evidence, both Friday and Wednesday must surrender to Thursday.

I find that the Sabbath which fell between the burial and the resurrection of the body of our Lord was double — forty-eight hours in length! These double Sabbaths were frequent, and well known to the Jews, though, as a rule, entirely overlooked by all classes of modern commentators. Such Sabbaths occurred at regular intervals of six or seven years. Aside from the Seventh-day Sabbaths, the Mosaic Law provided seven others, of which the Day of Atonement and the Passover Day⁷ were the most noteworthy. Like our Christ-

mas and New Year's Day, these, in the course of every few years, fell upon any and every day of the week. In the year of Jesus' death and resurrection, the Passover Day, one of the seven annual Sabbaths, Nisan 15th, fell upon Friday — fell so that its closing moment touched the opening moments of Saturday, Nisan 16th, the weekly Sabbath! That this Sabbath was more than ordinary is plainly evident from John xix. 31. It required no great amount of learning to grasp these things. A friend in Denver said to me last summer: "I have always known that this Sabbath was more than ordinary." Thus it is evident that Jesus was crucified upon the 14th, and died at the usual hour for the slaughtering of the lambs.⁸

It therefore follows, unavoidably, that the regular Passover supper, the feast of unleavened bread, was eaten by the inhabitants of Jerusalem hours (from five to seven) after the body was placed in the tomb. It follows just as certainly that Jesus, with his disciples, sat down to a Passover supper (Luke xxii. 8, 11, 13, 15; Mark xiv. 12, 14, 16, 17; Matt. xxvi. 17, 18, 19) about twenty-four hours before the usual time.⁹ Facts do not cease to be facts because they involve difficulties. John xviii. 28 refers, not to the Passover eaten by Jesus and his disciples, but to the regular Passover eaten in the night of Nisan 15th.¹⁰

There are two other feasts recorded, out of which "expert modern scholarship" is striving to make but one. Both these feasts were in Bethany and, in each instance, Jesus was anointed by a woman. But one feast was in the home of Lazarus and his sisters, while the other was in the house of Simon (John xii. 1-11; Matt. xxvi. 6-12; one was served on the evening which ushered in the Sabbath of Nisan 9th, and the other, four days later, in the opening (evening) hours of Wednesday, Nisan 13th.¹¹

Jesus arrived in Bethany (John xii. 1) on Friday, Nisan 8th. His arrival was probably so close to the end of this day that the supper of the 9th followed within less than three hours. The great majority of those who hold that Jesus was crucified upon Friday, claim also that he arrived in Bethany upon the previous Friday! That would be an impossibility. "Six days" (John xii. 1) before one Friday never did, and never can, bring one into the preceding Friday.¹²

Palm Sunday (Nisan 10th) stands, while Good Friday must go.¹³ Tuesday, the 12th, was the last day of Jesus' public ministry. Wednesday, the 13th, was a day of retirement throughout which Judas sought in vain for an opportunity to betray his Lord—an opportunity which never came till after the middle of the night of the 14th. Judas thus sat throughout the Lord's last Passover and through the Lord's Supper. He listened to the last discourses of the Master (John xiii. 36–xvii. 26). He followed to the very gates of Gethsemane, and never left to bring the soldiers till Peter and James and John (Mark xiv. 33) could no longer keep watch of him.

Such are the conclusions offered for the consideration of my readers.

Believing in the truth of the foregoing conclusions, it is the purpose of the author to do all in his power to gain for them a commanding position in the world of biblical thought. The purpose of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA in giving place to this article is closely allied to that of the writer. First of all, this Quarterly desires the truth upon this vexed question. In the next place, its editors wish that the severest tests known to the scholarly world be applied to these conclusions. If others are better, they are more than glad to get them.

It is doubtful if any set of conclusions ever faced a more formidable array of opposition. If they are correct, the Council of Trent was woefully wrong.¹⁴ But all the millions belonging to the Roman Catholic communion count the decisions of Trent as the wisdom of God. How can Protestants reverse these decisions? Our conclusions are not only blasphemy to the Roman Catholics, but also to the mighty host of Greek Catholics. With most Lutherans and the vast majority of Episcopalians, they are unthinkable. They cut the ground from under orthodox theology in every Protestant communion. So far as the writer knows, no communion, no college or university, no house publishing religious literature or Sunday-school supplies, no cyclopedia or dictionary of the Bible, no religious journal or magazine, stands for these conclusions.

Opposition comes not only from the united orthodoxy of the world, but also from the unbroken ranks of "advanced biblical scholarship." The writer has examined with great care much standard literature upon their side of this question. Among the works consulted are the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, *Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible* and his *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, the *Standard Dictionary of the Bible*, the volumes of the *International Critical Commentary* which have to do with the Gospels, "The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate," by Benjamin Wisner Bacon, of Yale, and others of the kind. If the conclusions presented in these pages are correct, the learned works just named should all be rewritten. From these sources it is seldom that one finds a word favorable, even on a minor matter. To adopt our conclusions is as impossible for them as for our brethren of the Roman Catholic communion. Though not bound by the decrees of Trent, they are just as securely

bound. They are bound by their "dearly bought scientific method." If our conclusions are correct, their method is not scientific.

As if this were not enough, we have that subtle opposition which is causing a number of prominent men to abandon Friday for Wednesday as the day of crucifixion.

To make our success appear impossible, certain facts stand like Gibaltars. For seventeen hundred years¹⁸ the religious world, in all of its antagonistic departments, has fortified itself against our conclusions. Last but not least, greater scholars than the writer have failed in their efforts to break down the prestige of Good Friday—to stay the progress of Wednesday, and to give Thursday its rightful place.

Under these conditions the writer never received a greater compliment in his life than that contained in his commission to prepare this article. On September 26, 1911, one of the editors wrote him as follows: "I shall be glad to do anything that may get the facts upon this vexed question so fairly to the front that no one can henceforth challenge them. This you are able to do," etc. I pray God for help to make good this confidence of my friend. By divine help, he shall never be ashamed of his words, "this you are able to do."

"In the face of such overwhelming odds, upon what do you base your hopes of success?"

Strange to say, not alone upon the truth of our conclusions! They have been true for nearly two thousand years, but have, during most of that time, been rejected as false. You know other truths which are faring the same way? We believe the time has come for them to triumph. God has his strategic moments which are made great by the resurrection of some buried truths. We believe such a moment calls for these truths.

Another ground of hope lies the poles apart from this. Our opposition is divided — hopelessly and fatally divided. In support of Good Friday, the Roman Catholics rely upon one main principle, while the Protestants depend upon another. If one is right, the other is wrong. Conservative Protestant scholars use certain facts in support of Friday. So-called advanced biblical scholars accept Friday and the facts alleged in its support, but use them in a destructive way. The conservatives claim that these facts do not contradict each other, while their opponents deny the claim. Who is right and who is wrong? Or wherein are both wrong? The very effort to unravel these questions should help one out of darkness into light. Furthermore, conservatives are in hopeless confusion in their efforts to support Friday. They are divided into three, if not four, hostile camps. The same is true of “advanced” scholars. No two positions could be more antagonistic or deadly, when applied to each other, than those of Mr. William Fredrick and Mr. Clark Braden in support of Wednesday. Moreover, neither is consistent within itself.¹³ I was driven from the Friday position by the hopeless contradictions of its supporters, together with its self-contradictions. For the same reasons I rejected the Wednesday position. Others have been driven away from those positions by these reasons. Why should not thousands and millions follow?

In these trying experiences I discovered the Thursday position and found it self-consistent. Or, better yet, this position found me — took possession of me and will not let go. Why should it not find others? Why should it not grip them? To the present hour I know nothing of what has been written in its favor, save three or four pages by Westcott. And even these were not read till I had tentatively adopted Thursday as the day. This position came to me,

not by way of authority, but over the highway of scientific induction. It holds me, not by pride of discovery, but by its power to unify all known facts and truths. Either Friday or Wednesday could have held me by this same power, had either been in possession of it. The spirit of our day is thoroughly scientific, and not at all favorable to authority. In such a day anything which unifies the facts and truths of any field of thought makes a powerful appeal to minds which are truly scholarly. One of our hopes is this unifying power — the power of a perfect induction of facts. All authority which does not square with the facts in this case, we believe, will be given up. Then Friday can no longer stand.

It is hoped that the readers of these pages will rightly interpret the positive statements already made and yet to come. They may be dogmatic, but their purposes are legitimate. Nothing is true simply because it is positively stated in these pages. The purpose of our dogmatism is to challenge the opposition and to thoroughly arouse our opponents. While very confident in our conclusions, we do not wish to shield them from the most crucial tests known to this scientific age. We want the opposition to do its best to overthrow them. To insure the fairest treatment of what they say and to produce something distinctly worthy of the attention of the greatest scholars of the age, I have asked the Editors of this Quarterly to coöperate with me and my critics in securing a disinterested commission, before whom and by whose help these problems may be more fully examined and truth thoroughly established. At the close of its investigations and its hearings, a report of its findings should be published. The time is ripe for such a report. Our hope of success lies largely with this commission. Will not scholars in America and England, in Australia and the Orient, in France and in Ger-

many, do all in their power to secure such a report and to make it absolutely thorough and commanding?¹⁷

For the consideration of such a commission our conclusions have been stated, and the chief objections to them will now be considered.

ARGUMENT ON THE DAY OF PREPARATION.

Advocates of Friday crucifixion reason as follows: (1) Jesus was crucified upon the Jewish Day of Preparation. (2) Friday was Preparation Day with the Jews, and no scholar can successfully deny it. (3) Therefore Jesus was crucified upon Friday. In this position they feel as secure as the North Star in its place. They further say, In this light Thursday must be wrong. This objection should be fairly met. Can it be done? We believe so.

We begin by admitting the first premise. There can be no discussion on this point.¹⁸ We follow with another admission, Friday was Preparation Day with the Jews! The evidence for this, both in the Bible and outside of it, is overwhelming.¹⁹ In all our reading, we have found but one writer daring enough to deny this fact.²⁰ Forced into a corner, he made the denial to save himself. He either had to do this or give up his theory of Wednesday crucifixion.

After the two admissions just recorded, how can the conclusion be successfully denied? First, because Friday was not the *only* Preparation Day. To place the conclusion beyond criticism, the word "only" must be written in the second member of the foregoing syllogism. This no scholar can do. Such an insertion converts the truth of the proposition into falsehood, and thus destroys the conclusion. The annual Sabbaths, as well as the weekly Sabbaths, had their Preparation days.²¹ And, what is more to the point, a Preparation Day for an annual Sabbath seldom fell on a Friday. When-

ever the great Passover Sabbath, Nisan 15th, fell on Monday, Sunday was its Preparation Day. In the course of time every day in the week, except the seventh, served as Preparation Day for Nisan 15th.

In the second place, we deny the conclusion on the ground that Friday was not always itself the Preparation Day for the seventh-day Sabbath. Whenever Nisan 15th fell upon Friday, and thus made of it a great Sabbath, it did not and could not serve as Preparation Day. In such a case, which was happening every six or seven years, Thursday became the Preparation Day for the double Sabbath—for the forty-eight hours of Sabbath covered by the annual Sabbath (Friday) and the weekly Sabbath (Saturday). Such was the combination in the year of our Lord's death. To overlook exceptions to rules is often fatal.

ARGUMENT ON THE DAY OF UNLEAVENED BREAD.

Another syllogism used in support of Good Friday is fallacious. It runs as follows: (1) Jesus was crucified upon the first day of unleavened bread. (2) Nisan 15th is the first day of unleavened bread. (3) Therefore Jesus was crucified, not upon Thursday, the 14th, but upon Friday, the 15th. Again we are able to admit both premises and yet deny the conclusion! Again, the friends of Friday have been misled by the second premise. To fully and conclusively serve their purposes, this premise should read: "The first day of unleavened bread" was never applied by the Jews to any other day than Nisan 15th. So stated it is absolutely false, and the desired conclusion becomes worthless.

It is well known that the Feast of Tabernacles, held in the seventh month, is spoken of both as a seven- and an eight-day period.²² There are different ways of treating such a state-

ment. An easy way is to brand it as absurd and to dismiss it at once. But can it be more absurd than some of our very common and useful statements?

Another way to treat such an expression is to study it seriously, with a desire to discover the reasons which gave it form and currency. In doing this you will find that the Jews used other than solar days, also twenty-four hours in length. From three o'clock on one solar day to the same hour on the next solar day is one day of twenty-four hours, just as truly as is the day from one sunset to another. To get such a day, which we will speak of as non-solar, you must have two solar days from which to carve it. If you want seven non-solar days, you must have eight solar days to contain them. Therefore this feast was properly spoken of as covering eight solar days or seven non-solar days. Furthermore, when seven non-solars are carved out of eight solars, there is no contradiction in calling either of two of the solars the first day of the period, provided the non-solars begin and end late in the solar days! For instance, since the seven non-solar days of this feast begin late on the 14th day (solar) of the seventh month, it (the 14th) may be rightly called "the first day." In which case the feast is and must be considered an eight (solar) day period. Since most of the hours of the first of the seven non-solars fall within the 15th of the seventh month, it (the 15th) may be rightly called "the first day." In which case the feast is considered as a seven (non-solar) day period.

Josephus speaks of the feast of unleavened bread — the Passover feast, both as a seven- and an eight-day affair.²³ There is no contradiction in this, as is often thoughtlessly assumed. It is based upon the principles just stated. In this usage Josephus has Moses back of him.²⁴ The New Testament writers, having the eight-day conception in mind, speak

of the "first day of unleavened bread,"²⁵ meaning Thursday, Nisan 14th. Present-day scholars of all kinds and classes, with hardly an exception, miss their meaning and wrongly claim Friday, Nisan 15th. Such blindness should cease and such misrepresentation of the Gospel writers should end.

ARGUMENT ON MATT. XXVIII. 1.

We will now consider Matt. xxviii. 1. Advocates of Wednesday crucifixion claim this as bed-rock, and build upon it a structure which they believe will never fall. They believe that his passage alone forever bars both Thursday and Friday. They are infallibly certain that it does. In expressing their certainty, they have exhausted the powers of the English language.

Their argument runs as follows: Jewish days began and ended with sunset. Three days and three nights (Matt. xii. 40), seventy-two hours, cover the time during which the body lay in the grave. When did these hours end? Matthew xxviii. 1 puts this question beyond all doubt. Mr. Fredrick says: "There is nothing in Matt. xxviii. 1, that in any way teaches that Christ rose on Sunday morning; . . . The New Testament Interlinear translates this verse: 'Now late on the Sabbath, as it was getting dusk, toward first of week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.' It gets 'dusk' in the evening, when the sun sets, and night approaches; not in the morning, when the sun rises."²⁶ When did these hours begin? Certainly they began late on Wednesday. Jesus died and was buried upon Wednesday, and not on Thursday. How can any one with common sense deny our conclusion? Such is their argument in brief.

This group of writers includes believers in the Lord's Day, but is made up chiefly of Seventh-day Adventists. First-day

men of this type hold to Sunday, not because Jesus rose then, but because he was first seen in its opening hour!

Upon the theory that their argument is valid, what does it do? (1) It does not adequately account for the rise and triumph of the Lord's Day. As a part of the Ten Commandments, the weekly Sabbath was strongly intrenched. For a new day to spring up and crowd out the old indicates tremendous power. This argument does not adequately account for that power. (2) From the beginning, Christian tradition has been practically unanimous in the belief that Jesus arose on the First Day of the week. The Lord's Supper, a New Testament ordinance, was celebrated upon this day for some reason. The argument leaves these things without any adequate cause or causes. (3) It contradicts all other Gospel statements concerning the time of the resurrection. These demand an early morning hour on Sunday. (4) According to the Gospels, both the friends and enemies of the Master—witnesses—thought that the earthquake which preceded the resurrection was in the night.²⁷ This argument places it in broad daylight—before sunset Saturday! (5) None of this havoc is necessary. There is a disposition of both Matt. xxviii. 1 and xii. 40 which avoids all these troubles. It is rational, simple, and in harmony with all the facts and truths involved. Yet this argument would crowd it out!

“One is on the wrong side,” says Dr. Beecher, “if he prefers interpretations that make Bible statements contradictory . . . rather than equally feasible interpretations that make them true. One is on the wrong side if he needlessly prefers interpretations that bring the statements of the Bible into conflict with facts known by means of evidence from other sources.”²⁸ If this is a true canon of criticism, the argument for Wednesday is discredited, to begin with.

Before rejecting it, however, let us analyze it. It contains two false assumptions. As will be seen hereafter and as shown before, Jewish days did not always begin at sunset. Why assume that they always do? While three days and three nights may be seventy-two hours, they often contain less, according to well-known Jewish usage. Why assume that they must contain just seventy-two, — no more, no less? It contains a very poor translation of the undisputed Greek of Matt. xxviii. 1. It ignores the literary nature of the passage, and fails to grasp the historic setting of the incidents which give it form. This alone is to condemn it.

What are the incidents which gave form to this passage? Briefly, they were these: Taking advantage of the custom which allowed a Sabbath-day's journey, three women, Salome and the two Marys, start for the tomb — start before sunset on the Sabbath, taking with them spices prepared before the double Sabbath began. Wanting more spices, Salome tarried till the shops were opened after sundown — after the Sabbath had come to an end. Having made her purchase, she hurried on to meet the two Marys, for the Galilean women had all planned to meet about that time to complete the embalming of the body. She meets the two Marys, who bring word to her, which compels a change of their plans. The grave is in charge of Roman soldiers, and the embalming cannot be performed till they are gone. Word is passed to the whole company of Galilean women, and all agree to try again in the morning, for the guard will then have completed their watch and will have gone. Next morning all come to the place, but in scattered groups, save Mary Magdalene, who started while it was yet dark, and who made more than one trip on account of the exciting things she discovered and hastened to tell.

What is the literary nature of the passage built upon these incidents? First of all, it is very, very much condensed. In the next place, it contains a time emphasis which is double.²⁹ One point of time emphasized is in the end of the Sabbath, corresponding with the journey begun at that time and soon completed by two of the three who started. The other point of time upon which emphasis is placed, is many hours later, "as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." This corresponds exactly with the time when the other Mary was returning to the City from the tomb—the time when Mary Magdalene was a second time approaching it. In its emphasis upon separated points of time it is like Mark xvi. 1, 2. Salome is omitted from the first because she never reached the tomb till Sunday morning. She is in the second because she was the buyer of spices for the company. The first opens before sunset, on the Sabbath; the second after sunset, when the Sabbath has past. Differing purposes concerning emphasis demand different openings. The first combines the two Marys because they went together to the tomb and discovered the Roman soldiers in charge. On account of its brevity and its peculiar construction, you infer that the second coming of the two Marys, like the first, was together. In the light of other passages, this inference is wrong. Blame the writer, if you must, for his awkward style; but do not forget that much of it may be due to an original translator. Meyer says: "Matthew is the Greek translation of an original Hebrew (Aramaic) writing." Great anxiety to be faithful to the original may have caused much of the obscurity. A record made at the time of the events—a condensed record made to preserve facts perfectly familiar to writer and readers—would naturally present just the troublesome structure found in this verse.

ARGUMENT UPON THE GREAT ASSUMPTION.

Oftentimes an assumption reigns like a tyrant, and holds in leash slaves by millions. For thousands of years a giant assumption, a Goliath, has dominated our field of thought. Most writers in favor of Friday³⁰ and all who stand for Wednesday, so far as the writer knows, are in abject bondage to this baseless but hoary assumption. Since we, as advocates of Thursday, rebel and refuse to serve, it is held against us as a fatal objection.

One way to word it is as follows: *For Jesus to eat a Pass-over supper twenty-four hours before the usual time is unthinkable.* No one knows who originated this assumption, but for thousands of years it has ruled like a czar. Both conservative and "advanced" critics are loyal to it. A destructive critic holds to it because it destroys the divine authority of the Gospels! At least one conservative holds to it because, as he thinks, Jesus demonstrated his deity by obeying it!

That certain passages (Luke xxii. 8, 11, 13, 15; Mark xiv. 12, 14, 16, 17; Matt. xxvi. 17-19) refer to events before the crucifixion, and that John xviii. 28 refers to events after the crucifixion, is too plain to need comment. One of these Pass-over suppers was eaten in the night of Thursday, Nisan 14th,³¹ and the other in the night of the 15th.³² And between them, on the day of the 14th, Jesus died on the cross. Now notice what obedient slaves of the assumption do. In spite of the plain, strong words of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, one of them denies that the first feast was a passover feast!³³ Why not deny that A is A, or that B is B? He was forced, either to give up his theory of Wednesday crucifixion or to make this pitiful denial. Most others do differently but no better. They rob John xviii. 28 of the meaning given it by the Apostles, and fill it full of something different, thus getting it out of

their way. This leaves but one Passover feast, which they transfer from the night of the 14th to that of the 15th. This transfer makes it also necessary to transfer the death of Jesus from the day of the 14th to the 15th.

This lays a splendid foundation for the "advanced" critic. He says to his conservative brother, "Let us not deny that A is A. Let us treat John xviii. 28 just as we do the passages from the Synoptic writers. Let us admit two Passovers, but by no means let us fail to be loyal to our precious, our valuable assumption." This looks good to the conservative and he consents. But later he is shocked. If Jesus died upon the 14th, and if there is but one Passover feast, the 15th, the Synoptists are wrong; if on the 15th, then John is wrong; in either event the assumption governs, and the Gospel writers contradict each other! And final authority is not with conflicting Gospels, but with the verdict of "modern expert scholarship"!

If Jesus had chosen to die on the 15th, he could have once more eaten the Passover at the usual or regular hour, and thus would have fulfilled that part of the law for the twentieth or twenty-fifth time in his life. But in doing so how could he fulfil the type of the dying lamb? How could he pour out his blood on the 14th, at the typical time — the sacrificial hour, about three o'clock in the afternoon of Nisan 14th — an hour emphasized annually for fifteen hundred years? Since it was absolutely impossible for him to eat the supper at the usual hour and also to fulfil the type of the shed blood, he chose the more important of the two and ate the Passover twenty-four hours out of its usual time.

I am sorry to know that one able conservative scholar, to whom I am greatly indebted, feels that he must surrender the divinity of Jesus the Christ, if he accepts the unusual hour of

our Lord's Passover!³⁴ He is not only loyal to that baseless assumption, but insists that the Son of God was also under the power of its tyranny! In reading his article, published in this Quarterly over one year ago,³⁵ I felt the powerful force of another assumption underlying it—the assumption that the Passover law was an unchangeable law and more sacred than the Ten Commandments.³⁶ This also is utterly baseless. Inside of a few months after the Passover law was given, Moses changed it for certain parties a whole month;³⁷ but Jesus loses his divinity if he changes it twenty-four hours! Is Jesus less than Moses? In their later history the Hebrew people made a half-dozen changes in the Passover law in order to adapt it to their central sanctuary; for example slaying the lambs within the Temple walls instead of at the homes of the worshippers. These changes are well known and were made with the sanction of Jehovah; but, according to my friend's last assumption, Jehovah could not give consent for Jesus to make a change of a few hours—a change which would enable him to fulfil the time-type of the Passover blood! With me, conservative blindness is worse for the cause of truth than blindness on the part of a destructive critic. If we are ever worthy to put an end to “higher critical fancies,” we must open our eyes, we must cast out every false assumption, we must see things as they are, we must get together, we must present a perfect induction of all the facts.

ARGUMENT FOR FIFTY-NINE OR SIXTY HOURS.

“How is it possible for any event which happens *on* the third day to be truthfully placed *after* the third day?” By such critics as Dr. Bacon of Yale, this is considered as a hopeless contradiction and is treated accordingly. Most conservatives dodge the issue or confuse it.³⁸

Please turn to a previous page and refresh your memory concerning solar and non-solar days. Jesus died at three o'clock on Thursday. Counting three non-solar days from that hour brings us to the same hour on the following Sunday. Did not Jesus rise from the dead ten or eleven hours before this third day ended? Is it not proper, therefore, to say, he arose *on* the third day?

Now turning to solar days, let me ask a few questions. Jesus arose, probably, between three and four o'clock on Sunday morning. Was not this *on* the fourth day? Was it not after Thursday? And after Friday? And after Saturday? Is it not, therefore, just as proper to say that Jesus arose *after* three days? That both these principles are woven into Old and New Testament literature upon the Passover is a fact, not a theory.³⁹

ASTRONOMICAL ARGUMENT.

We now come to the astronomical phases of our subject. The most fatal objection, in the estimation of some persons, against the conclusions set forth in these pages, is based in astronomy. "Astronomy is against Thursday, making it impossible."

From whom does this objection come? It comes, first, from a champion of Wednesday, and he presses it with tremendous energy. As before noted, some very prominent Christian workers have been convinced by his arguments. But the objection is by no means as strong as it appears. Astronomy has been so badly abused by its friends that it has practically no meaning — no weight in this field of thought. Limited space forbids a catalog of the absurd and contradictory things perpetrated in the name of astronomy and within the field of our investigation. The trouble began in the second

stage of the Easter Controversy, not far from A.D. 200. First one and then another astronomical cycle was followed, only to be abandoned.⁴⁰ That Jesus died on March 25th and rose from the dead on the 27th, A.D. 29, a most absurd position, was long held in the name of astronomy. The Council of Nice is supposed to have wrestled with the astronomy of our problem, and Gregory XIII. put forth his efforts in reforming the calendar. So the trouble has come down to us in a hopeless tangle. In Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible, Dr. C. H. Turner builds up a wonderful astronomical argument in favor of Friday.⁴¹ Not one college professor in a hundred can find a flaw in it. It is one of the most remarkable efforts on record. Other advocates of Friday have unwittingly built an astronomical structure which fully satisfies all the demands of Thursday! To cap the climax of confusion, the two stoutest champions of Wednesday known to the writer are hopelessly at war in their astronomy. Astronomy is discredited by its friends and needs redemption. Why not begin here and now?

The facts of the case are that one of the leading schools among astronomers unanimously concede that Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, Nisan 14th to 17th, fell on April 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th, A.D. 30. Dr. Philip Schaff belonged to this school, and so did Professor W. F. Lynn, late of the Royal Observatory of Greenwich.⁴² This kind of astronomy is exactly in accord with the conclusions set forth in this essay — conclusions demanded by each and every one of the four Gospels.

Strange to say, this astronomy was not built for the purpose it is here serving; it was built to support Friday. Laboring under the long-standing mistake that Jesus died on Nisan 15th, believers in Friday crucifixion built up this astronomy. Was it a purely scientific structure, or was it based upon in-

sufficient data and made to serve a partisan purpose? Do not be too much astonished when I record my profound conviction in favor of the latter alternative. The one thing essential to a perfect scientific structure, these astronomers did not have. Such a task was, therefore, beyond their powers. If this astronomy is the only true astronomy, it came by accident or by an overruling providence, not by an induction of all the facts. I want just such astronomy, but this concession is due my readers.

The strongest astronomical argument in favor of Wednesday has never yet been built, so far as the writer knows. The materials for it are as follows: (1) The conjunction, known among the Jews as the "molad" and among us as the astronomical new moon, nearest the spring equinox of A.D. 30, fell within a few minutes of 8 P. M., March 22d. In fixing the 1st of Nisan, this was one of the most indispensable factors. Fortunately for the cause of Wednesday, modern astronomers are agreed upon this fact. And it is one of the only two important facts in this field upon which they are agreed! (2) In the Jewish Encyclopedia there is a rule for fixing the 1st of the seventh month of the Jewish year by the help of the "molad," or conjunction.⁴⁸ Briefly stated, it is as follows: When the conjunction occurs before noon of any Jewish day, that day is counted the 1st of the month; when it occurs after noon, the next day is counted as the 1st. (3) Let us apply this rule to the case in hand. What we speak of as 8 P. M., March 22d, with the Jews would be the second hour of March 23d. This follows because our 22d ends at midnight and their 23d begins at sunset, six hours previous. Again, all astronomers agree that March 23d, A.D. 30, was a Thursday. Therefore, Nisan 1st, which was also the first day of the new year, fell on Thursday, March 23d. If so, the four

Thursdays following were March 30th, April 6th, 13th, and 20th. And the corresponding dates of Nisan were the 8th, 15th, 22d, and 29th. This makes April 6th and Nisan 15th (an annual Sabbath) coincide, and the day of the week is Thursday. According to the New Testament writers, Jesus died and was buried on the 14th of Nisan, and his body rested in the tomb throughout the 15th and 16th. Since the 14th of that Nisan was a Wednesday, both Thursday and Friday crucifixion must be given up!

Compared with this argument, that of Dr. Turner, in support of Friday, is nowhere. This is closely built and almost flawless; that is loosely constructed and has in it nothing conclusive. Why not accept the one above? (1) Because it calls for Wednesday crucifixion while, as has been clearly and fully shown, I trust, the Gospels call for Thursday. The issue is squarely joined and clear cut. If this argument is valid, the Gospels are wrong. I choose to stand by the Gospels. (2) Nevertheless, I would accept it, if it were flawless, and make the best I could of its clash with the New Testament.

What is that flaw? It is in the rule found in the Jewish Encyclopedia. This rule may be in use now, but that it was used in the days of Jesus is very improbable, the writers of this Encyclopedia, themselves being witness. Furthermore, when applied to the astronomic new moon for the seventh month, it has so many exceptions that the rule comes very near being an exception, and the exceptions, near being the rule. In fixing the 1st of Nisan, more than one of these exceptions, applied, would have thrown its first day upon March 24th. In which case there would not have been any conflict between the record and the astronomy.

The truth is that astronomers have not the materials with which to determine the 1st of Nisan, A.D. 30. Without aid

from outside their own science they are absolutely helpless. Upon this point I am especially anxious for the help of the commission into whose hands this article should fall. If they find it well taken, one of the greatest causes of confusion is forever banished. In fixing Nisan 1st, A.D. 30, was the committee of the Jewish Sanhedrin guided by witnesses who observed the new moon or by astronomical calculations, or by both? If they were guided by calculations, did they use the Metonic cycle or another of those well known? If they used the Metonic cycle, as some think, what was the Golden Number of the year A.D. 29? Did the last month in A.D. 29 have in it 29 or 30 days? Was A.D. 29 a leap year? The committee which fixed the 1st of Nisan, A.D. 30, knew perfectly the answers for every one of these questions and of others necessary to their work; no modern astronomer is able to certainly answer one of them!⁴⁴ Furthermore, if some astronomer could answer every one of them he would yet be unable to know how that ancient committee combined the resultant materials in working out their problem.

We may sum up this part of the discussion in various ways. All astronomers are agreed that the astronomical new moon fell close to 8 P. M., upon March 22d, A.D. 30,⁴⁵ which the Jews would have spoken of as March 23d, about the end of its second hour. What were the possibilities of the 14th, under such a condition? It might have fallen upon either one of three days, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday. Why accept Thursday and reject Friday and Wednesday? Because the Gospel records call for Thursday as Nisan 14th.

Another summing up is interesting. The Gospels call for a double Sabbath between the death and resurrection of our Lord. In other words, they call for the Friday nearest the middle of the month to be an annual Sabbath. To be that it

must be the 15th of Nisan. With the 16th of Nisan as the regular weekly Sabbath, we have the double Sabbath required. With a forty-eight-hour Sabbath, covering the 15th and the 16th, Jesus must have died on Thursday, Nisan 14th, and he must have risen from the dead on Sunday, the 17th. How often is such a combination possible? But once in six or seven years. In either the years 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, did the conjunction occur at a time to give this double Sabbath on the 15th and the 16th? Astronomy can answer this question and it says, No! Was its occurrence in A.D. 30 favorable to the combination of the double Sabbath? Astronomy can answer and does say, Yes! Here again Dr. Turner, who holds for A.D. 29 as the crucifixion year, is worsted. No dates in the life of Christ are more certainly known than Nisan 14th to 17th, Thursday to Sunday inclusive, April 6th to 9th, A.D. 30.

CONCLUSION.

The literature on the Passion Week covers a vast area. In this territory there is a miracle of accuracy and a mountain of blunders. "Modern scholarship" is a thousand miles away from that accuracy, and the New Testament writers are farther from those blunders! The "assured results" of modern New Testament criticism come direct from that mountain; the results of valid scientific criticism are only possible by a closer following of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These writers, speaking of Nisan 14th to 17th, cannot be confirmed by modern astronomy; but modern astronomers must appeal their conflicting claims to a non-astronomical court—to that court where the four Gospel writers sit as judges. Concerning the committee of the Sanhedrin which fixed the calendar of that month, Nisan, two questions loom

large, WHAT did they do? And HOW did they do it? No man on earth can answer the second question! Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John do answer the first. What do you think of their answer? Which do you prefer? The miracle of Judeo-Christian accuracy or the mountain of German sophistry? Or will you stand by traditionalism, old in years but blind from its birth?

NOTES.

¹For ten years the author was Dean of the College of the Bible, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa. Two years ago he resigned, and now holds the chair of Christian Evidences.

²The writer belonged to one of fourteen classes that fared thus.

³As a rule, the days throughout this article are of this kind, from sunset to sunset.

⁴As a rule, the Gospel of John speaks of the day as extending from midnight to midnight. In xix. 14, John follows the Roman method. In xv. 25 Mark follows the Jewish method. There is no conflict, as Sir William Ramsay believes (*Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. II. p. 634, col. 1).

⁵See *Dated Events of the Old Testament*, p. 14a.

⁶For his words, and the quotations which accompany the reference, see William Fredrick's *Was Jesus the Christ*, pp. 114-125.

⁷This expression, "the Passover Day," is often and appropriately applied to the 14th, the day upon which the lambs were slain. Here it is applied to the day of the feast, the 15th.

⁸On these points, I am fortunate in having support from Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock. See *Hastings's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. I. p. 417, col. 2.

⁹Mr. Hitchcock says: "The Fourth Gospel gives unqualified support to the opinion that the feast of which our Lord partook had a quasi-Paschal significance, and preceded in order to supersede the Jewish Passover." In support he quotes John xviii. 28; xix. 14, 31 (*op. cit.*, p. 414, col. 1).

¹⁰See *supra*, note 3.

¹¹While Mr. Hitchcock is too "advanced" to agree with me on this point, he notes it as a possibility (*op. cit.*, p. 416, col. 1).

¹²This almost universal blindness on the part of those holding for Friday crucifixion is caused by careless and inaccurate use of such prepositions as "before," "after," "since," etc. While Dr.

David Roberts Dungan is dominated by mistaken rules (*Outline Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 75, 81), he is wise enough to see the "impossibility" which is overlooked by every other authority consulted by the writer, unless it be Mr. Hitchcock (*op. cit.*, p. 416. col. 2).

"On this point, the Roman Catholics are wrongly reproved (Dungan, *op. cit.*, p. 75a).

"See art. "Calendar," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. iii. p. 165.

"That Jesus died on Nisan 14th was a well-known fact among Christians of the first two centuries. See almost any cyclopedia: but beware of the confusion introduced by most writers. The blindness which has made the Passion Week almost hopeless, as a problem, has remade history of the first two or three centuries, and it requires insight to sift the chaff from the wheat. One of the clearest and most faithful treatments is in the arts. "Easter" and "Easter Controversy," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. v.

"In his *Trials and Crucifixion of Christ*, Mr. Braden must have failed to read his proofs. His dates are in hopeless confusion. His scheme of events is ingenious, but out of harmony with the facts presented in the Gospels. On p. 19a of his booklet (*Was Jesus the Christ?*), Mr. Fredrick garbles an astronomical statement, and tries to ride two horses going in opposite directions!

"These pages are already translated into the Japanese language and, with the permission of the Bibliotheca Sacra, will be published soon in the Sunrise Kingdom. Advance copies are in the hands of interested parties in Australia and New Zealand. E. Walter Maunder, F.R.A.S., of the Greenwich Observatory, and author of the *Astronomy of the Bible*, is in the possession of a copy. His help in the astronomical part of this paper was important. Alfred Seddon, of Paris, may review it in the French language, and Mr. Osterhus, of Ossian, Iowa, will translate it for Scandinavian readers, if my conclusions commend themselves to him. Dr. René Gregory, of Leipzig University, has been personally consulted upon Matt. xxviii. 1 and upon other points discussed in this paper, and has been asked to see that it is reviewed in some leading German periodical. All these are in possession of advance copies.

"Matt. xxvii. 62; Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 14, 31, 42.

"Read Ex. xvi. 22-31. If verses 22, 29, do not make Friday the Day of Preparation, is the Word clear on any point? Just here most cyclopedias are strong.

"If dogmatism were dynamite, Mr. Braden could carry everything before him (*Trials and Crucifixion of Christ*, p. 77).

^a See 2 Chron. xxxv. 16 (also ver. 4, 6, 10, 11, 14, 15); xxx. 15; Josh. v. 10; Num. ix. 2-5; Ex. xii. 6, 7.

^a A seven-day period (Lev. xxiii. 34, 36, 39, 42; Num. xxix. 12); an eight-day feast (Lev. xxiii. 36, 39; Num. xxix. 35).

^a So says Barton W. Johnson in *People's New Testament*, vol. i. p. 308, comment on Luke xxii. 7, 8.

^a Period of seven days (Ex. xii. 15; xiii. 6, 7; Num. xxviii. 17); period of eight days (Deut. xvi. 3, 4). Here the feast is twice spoken of as seven days, Nisan 14th not included. Then the 14th is brought in under these words, "the first day." This involves the eight-day conception. I count this discovery one of great importance.

^a Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7.

^a Was Jesus the Christ, p. 55.

^a Matt. xxviii. 13; xxvii. 64.

^a Reasonable Biblical Criticism, p. 23.

^a Matt. xxviii. 1 is made up from two distinct facts: (1) Late on the Sabbath day, . . . came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. (2) As it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre. To allow but one journey for these two is a fatal blunder.

^a In his *People's New Testament*, Barton W. Johnson is the only advocate of Friday who is free, so far as the writer knows. For another who is partly free, see *supra*, note 9. Neither Zahn nor Eidersheim escaped. It is to be regretted that neither of these great scholars saw the truths contained in notes 24 and 25.

^a See *supra*, note 9.

^a See *supra*, note 3.

^a Fredrick, Was Jesus the Christ, p. 37.

^a *Ibid.*, pp. 90-95.

^a Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1911, pp. 503-509.

^a More sacred, because Jesus changed more than one of those; but, according to Mr. Fredrick, he could not change one item of the Passover law!

^a Numbers ix. 6-12. For a greater change, see 2 Chron. xxx. 18.

^a In his chapter upon this matter, in *Jesus and Jonah*, J. W. McGarvey confuses his readers, and fails to prove his point.

^a See *supra*, notes 24 and 25.

^a See art. "Easter Controversy," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. v. pp. 227 ff.

" Vol. 1. pp. 412 ff.

"The true position of Mr. Lynn is concealed by Mr. Fredrick, and another is attributed to him. See *supra*, note 16; also Homiletic Review, April, 1909, for Professor Lynn's original article.

"See art. "Calendar," Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. II. p. 503, col. 2a.

"I am assured by an astronomer of international reputation. D. W. Morehouse, of Drake University, that one problem yet lacking complete solution, is the exact length of time between the conjunction and the earliest moment of visibility.

"Here, again, is a crucial point. Our commission should not pass it too hastily. In the opening years of my special study upon these problems, I labored under a false impression. I supposed that astronomers differed twenty-four hours in fixing the time of the March conjunction for A.D. 30. Within the last year, I have consulted such astronomers as Walter S. Harshman (wrongly spelled, p. 21, Was Jesus the Christ?), of the Annapolis Naval Academy; E. W. Brown, of Yale, "the best authority in America upon all questions concerning the moon" (Moorehouse). For two others, see *supra*, notes 17 and 44. I wrote also to Mr. Lynn, but he died a few days before my letter reached him. If I understand these learned men, all astronomers agree upon the time of the conjunction, within a few minutes; but in using it to fix the 1st of Nisan, they differ one day, or about twenty-four hours. As I show in my closing pages, they differ where they have no astronomical data to guide them—where, also, the theologians have misguided them! May we not also say, where the preceding article comes to them with much needed help?

ARTICLE VIII.

JESUS THE RABBI.

BY LESTER REDDIN, B.D., MILTON, PA.

THE years of the public ministry of Jesus (26-29 A.D.) fell within a period of very great didactic activity on the part of the leaders of thought in Israel. Such destitution of religious instruction as is predicated of the land of Judah in the period immediately preceding the reforms of Asa, when the people were "without a teaching priest" (2 Chron. xv. 3), could not now be found in Palestine. In the conception of these people, religion was the paramount concern for themselves, their children, and their neighbors; therefore their most vigorous endeavors were for the conservation and propagation of the faith which they had received as a heritage from their fathers. Not only had their zeal for proselyting the Gentiles reached that degree of intensity which called forth from the lips of him who spake as "never man spake" the hyperbolic statement, "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte" (Matt. xxiii. 15); but even greater effort was put forth for the instruction of the native sons of the Covenant in the distinctive tenets of Judaism. When the Nazarene first appeared on the scene of John's baptism and began to gather disciples about him, the echo of the voices of Hillel and Shammai could still be heard in Jerusalem; Gamaliel, a supposed descendant of King David, was now rising to the height of his influence as the chief exponent of the more liberal type of Rabbinism in the city which was once the capital of his royal ancestor. Perhaps young Saul of Tarsus was just completing his theolog-

ical studies at the feet of this great teacher when Jesus, early in his ministry, "went up into the mountain" and "taught" those who had gathered around him. The maxim of Hillel, "An ignorant man cannot be truly pious," had become a settled conviction; and, consequently, the Scribe, whose function was no less the teaching of the Law than its theoretical development, was by no means an inconspicuous person in Jerusalem. No effort was spared to popularize religious instruction. A "parochial school" (בית הספר) in connection with each synagogue afforded instruction in the Law to boys above the age of six or seven years, thus preparing them for membership in the synagogue, and citizenship in the community. The Scribal College (בית המדרש), analogous to the modern theological seminary, gave more technical instruction in the text and traditional interpretation of the Law to those who in turn became teachers of the people.

Perhaps this condition of affairs was due, in large measure, to a reaction from the "national apostasy" brought about by the secularizing tendencies of the Hasmonæan princes, especially their alliance with the party of the Sadducees, who, as Professor Buhl says, were "prepared to sacrifice the sacred uniqueness of Israel for worldly advantages." A more auspicious means for the conservation of the interests of religion could not have been chosen than a general diffusion of a knowledge of religious principles and practices. True fidelity to the cause of any religion is dependent on deep-seated convictions in the hearts of its devotees, and such convictions are the result, not of wielding the sword, however skillfully done, but of education. In other words, it is impossible to inculcate moral and religious principles by means of physical force; the task requires a pedagogical procedure.

The leaders in the educational propaganda were the Phar-

isees, the spiritual successors of the Hasidæans, the "Puritans" of that day. In contrast with the Athenian philosophers who "spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or hear some new thing," those who sat "in Moses' seat" sought to perpetuate the doctrines handed down from the ancients.

I. THE NONDESCRIPT TEACHER.

In the fullness of time Jesus appeared as a teacher truly "come from God." He entered upon his work greatly handicapped, however, as compared with his contemporaries. He had no such credentials as would commend him to the ruling class in Jerusalem; he had never been taught in their schools (בתי מדרשות); he hailed from a section of Palestine, i.e. Galilee, which by the learned aristocracy of Jerusalem was considered far inferior to Judea, not only in the matter of religious devotion, but in the matter of general culture as well. He never identified himself with the fraternity of professional teachers; he freely criticized them when he had occasion to do so; he charged them with "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men" rather than the commandments of God. But he courageously assumed the rôle of a religious teacher. He utilized every opportunity afforded him by the hunger of the multitude, the drawing of water from the well by the housewife, the tears of the grief-stricken sisters at the grave of their brother, the collection for the Temple treasury, and the Sabbath worship in the synagogue for the introduction of his subjects to the minds of his pupils. This he considered no insignificant part of his work on earth. The voluntary yielding up of his life he frequently refers to as the supreme act of obedience to his Father (John x. 17; cf. Luke xii. 50), and service to men (Matt. xx. 28); but he does not fail to emphasize the importance of his didactic

office. Nine times he refers to himself as teacher (*διδάσκαλος*) or as teaching (*διδάσκειν*); ten times he calls his followers "disciples" (*μαθηταί*, "learners"). Nor did he fail to impress with his teaching those who came under his influence: they listened attentively to the instruction that he spontaneously gave them, and so impressed were they with him and with the force of his message that they requested further instruction concerning the manner in which they should pray (Luke xi. 1), the coming of Elijah (Matt. xvii. 11; Mark ix. 12), the meaning of the parable of the tares of the field (Matt. xiii. 36), the frequency with which they should forgive the offending brother (Matt. xviii. 21), and the time of the inauguration of the Kingdom (Acts i. 6). He measured up to the expectation of the Samaritan woman who looked for the coming of a Messiah who should tell her "all things"; Nicodemus, a noted teacher in Israel and a member of the sanhedrin, speaking, perhaps, for others as well as for himself, by addressing Jesus as "Rabbi" recognized his right to be heard as a religious teacher, and he furthermore expressed a sincere conviction of the divine appointment of this Great Teacher.

II. HIS PEDAGOGY.

Jesus manifested, in an unwonted degree, that strength of personality, that masterful command of his subject, that sympathetic knowledge of his pupils, so indispensable to the success of a teacher. His remarkable insight into human nature, manifested in his tactful pedagogical methods, confirms the assertion of the Evangelist, "He knew what was in man and needed not that any one should tell him" (John ii. 25). In the matter of presenting "first things first," of preparing the minds of his hearers for an unwelcome truth by patient and painstaking preliminary training, of presenting his message

in language and thought-forms familiar to the people, he was well abreast of the best pedagogical methods of our own day. It is a plausible assumption that a wise music teacher would first teach the beginner in music to read the notes on the staff and to manipulate the key-board of the instrument rather than set her to play Beethoven's "Sonata Appassionata." The instructor in mathematics would never think of calling upon a pupil in the primary grade to demonstrate the Pythagorean proposition concerning the right-angled triangle; but, on the contrary, he would teach him notation, numeration, and the fundamental operations of arithmetic. Likewise Jesus, when he began the training of his disciples, gave them only such instruction as they were able to comprehend, and he wisely withheld new truths from them until they were able to "bear them" (John xvi. 12; Mark iv. 33). For example, the announcement of his passion, which, even at the late date at which it was given, fell with such horror on their ears, was purposely withheld until the disciples had learned from his words and works to believe in him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. xvi. 16 ff.).

Noteworthy is the consideration which he had for the individuality of his pupils. He recognized that not all men are cast in the same psychological mold, and therefore he never required any one to be other than himself. He dealt with each one according to his characteristic endowment, his courage or his timidity, his ease or his difficulty in apprehending the truth. He was not willing that any one should fail, from the lack of patient restatement and elucidation, to grasp the great truths which he taught. He was ever ready to answer a question in order to remove a doubt or a perplexity from the mind of one of his pupils (*vid.* John xiv. 22). Even the question "How can these things be?" he did not resent when coming

from the lips of an honest inquirer after the truth, notwithstanding he refused to answer the question, perfectly legitimate as to its form and content, "By what authority doest thou these things?" when propounded in the spirit of antagonism. He pronounced a beatitude upon those whose credulity does not always require sensible evidence for its support; and there is an ineffable tenderness in his words to Thomas, who was unable to accept the report of the resurrection of his Lord without an ocular demonstration of its correctness. He very considerably refrained from giving a categorical answer to the question of the imprisoned and forlorn Baptist: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" He saw that what John — now in a mood akin, perhaps, to that into which his ancient prototype fell under the juniper tree — most needed, was to have rehearsed to him the facts upon which the answer to his question must be based, so that he might have the heart discipline which he would receive from making his own synthesis, that he might once more have set in motion within his heart those chords which vibrated spontaneously at the sight of the Spirit's descent upon Jesus at his baptism.

III. HIS MESSAGE.

His message comprised religion and ethics only, not science or philosophy. It is true, he could see in the lilies of the field a beauty far excelling the regal splendor of King Solomon, but he never discoursed upon the geographical distribution, the different habits of growth, and the commercial value of the two hundred genera of the family *Liliaceæ*. In his parabolic teaching he points out many interesting analogies between the laws of agriculture and fruit-growing on the one hand and the great spiritual realities on the other,

e.g. his parables of the sower, the grain of mustard seed, the wheat and the tares, the barren fig tree, the vine and its branches; but here he seizes on the most commonplace facts, perfectly familiar to his hearers, and uses them to illustrate spiritual truths.

1. *His Ethical Message.* It is as a teacher of ethics that Jesus is to-day accorded by far the more liberal hearing. Thousands who have no personal interest in religion, whether Christian or pagan, have, either through choice or through the force of environment, adopted many of the ethical principles of Christianity as the measure of their own conduct and the criterion by which they judge the conduct of others. The ancient people of Jehovah who have never accepted the Christian interpretation of "the Man of Galilee" are coming more and more to recognize the value to the world of his ethical teaching. Rabbi Solomon Schindler says: "It cannot be denied that to a great extent our present civilization has evolved from Christian principles; we are surrounded from all sides by Christian customs and usages; our public schools, although they are claimed to be non-sectarian, are enshrouded by an atmosphere of Christian tendencies; take all in all, you must concede that Christianity is a factor in life which it would be unwise to overlook in our calculations."

Although our esteemed writer of the Jewish faith denies, in another connection, that Jesus was the founder of Christianity, he recognizes the presence and potency among men of those principles which he readily concedes to be "Christian," and which, according to the Gospel records, were taught by the Rabbi of Nazareth to his first followers.

Strange to say, in view of the foregoing, in the ethical teaching of Jesus, originality does not hold as large a place as was formerly supposed. Nor did he make the unreserved

claim for the precedence, as to point of time, of his statements that is often made by his followers. Indeed, to his mind, the force of his ethical precepts depends not so much upon the priority of his own utterance as upon the authority back of that utterance. Therefore he repeated much that had already been given, and added the weight of his own authority thereto. Even those things that are often said to be most distinctively Christian are but the repetition of that which God had already been pleased to reveal through the Old Testament. For example, when he gave utterance to that sublime ethical maxim, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," euphoniously called the Golden Rule, he distinctly states that "This is the Law and the Prophets." His teaching concerning the indissolubility of the marriage tie was quite at variance with the standards of his own day, and, to the minds of his hearers, incongruous with the Mosaic legislation designed to regulate divorce; but he declares that he is only stating a principle as old as the human family, and he seems to insinuate that they should have known this principle, by way of inference, from the statement in the early part of Genesis concerning the creation of man and the institution of the family.

That which is most unique in his ethical teaching is the principle which he lays down for governing one's conduct toward one's enemy. Such conduct must have both an active and a passive aspect. On the passive side, men are forbidden to retaliate the wrongs sustained at the hands of others: "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." On the active side, they are enjoined to return words and deeds of love for such injuries: "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, and pray for them that despitefully use you."

Although this principle had been discussed centuries before Christ, as is evinced by the *Memorabilia* of Confucius compiled by his pupils, it is not enjoined by any of the world's great ethicists until it is uttered, with the dynamic "*I say unto you*," by Jesus of Nazareth. To the question, "What think you of the principle that injury should be recompensed with kindness?" he whose virtue is said to have equaled heaven and earth replied: "With what then will you recompense kindness? Recompense injury with justice, and kindness with kindness." Jesus, indeed, placed a high premium on justice; he classified "justice, mercy, and faith" as "the weightier matters of the Law," and he reproves, in no uncertain tone, certain of his contemporaries for their disregard for such weighty matters; but it is not always the duty of men to mete out justice to their fellows. There are cases in which this prerogative is reserved by the Judge of all; it is God who will "avenge his own elect."

2. *His Religious Message.* Jesus places the greater emphasis upon his work as a religious teacher. With him spiritual things are of paramount importance. On the evening preceding his passion he says, in addressing his Father, "I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do." He makes obvious to us the character of that work which he complacently speaks of as accomplished, by his further statements in this prayer, such as, "I manifested thy name unto the men whom thou gavest me," and "I made known unto them thy name." There comes almost spontaneously to one's mind the contrast between these words and the admonition which Confucius gave to his pupils concerning their attitude toward the divinities. "While respecting spiritual beings," said the great sage of China, "to keep one's self aloof from them may be called wis-

dom." The ethics of Jesus loses much of its dynamic when dissociated from his religious teaching. The "Golden Rule" is often quoted without the *gold*; the gold is the *therefore* with which the speaker introduces the sentence, thus subjoining his precept, in which is epitomized the whole catalog of the reciprocal duties of men, to an antecedent statement designed to show that man's obligation to his fellow is grounded in the paternal kindness of God to men.

(1) *God*. In his teaching concerning God we discover a very distinct advance beyond the revelation which God had made of himself through Old Testament history and prophecy. The lofty conception of the being and perfection of God, however, which the saints of the old dispensation presented, he neither corrected nor supplanted; he merely added to it. The self-existence — implicit in the very name *יהוה* — of God (Ex. iii. 14), his unity (Deut. vi. 4; Isa. xlv. 6), eternity (Ps. xc. 2), omnipresence (Ps. cxxxix. 7 ff.; Jer. xxiii. 23, 24; 1 Kings viii. 27), omnipotence (Gen. xviii. 14; Job xlii. 2; Jer. xxxii. 17), are all doctrines that are abundantly taught in the Old Testament. That this God loved his own covenant people was indubitable, and it was the confident expectation that he would send his Messiah who should deliver his people from the hand of their oppressor (Luke i. 71). But the love of God in its world-embracing aspect had not been fully revealed until it was proclaimed to "a teacher in Israel" by the greater "Teacher come from God." The love of God for sinful men is the keynote of that evangel which he commands his disciples to carry to the whole world, the diapason of that festal music which fills the father's banquet hall on the occasion of the prodigal's return. It is through the boundless love of God that the scope of the "good tidings of great joy," at first proclaimed by the angel of the Lord

for "the whole people" (*παντὶ τῷ λαῷ*) of Israel (Luke ii. 10), has been enlarged so as to include the "all peoples" (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*) of the great commission (Matt. xxviii. 19).

His teaching concerning the spiritual nature of the true worship of God, while presenting a striking divergence from the prevalent conception of worship in his day, is not essentially different from the teaching of the prophets (cf. Ps. li. 16 ff.; Isa. xxix. 13; Ezra xxxiii. 31).

(2) *Himself*. Cognate to his doctrine of the love of God is his doctrine of his own person and work. It is the love of God for the world that led him to give his Son for the life of men, and Jesus confidently declares himself to be the Son of God. This divine sonship he represents as *sui generis*. The peacemakers, those who, by their benevolence to their enemies, evidence a spirit akin to that of the Heavenly Father, and those who "shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead," he calls "sons of God." But he speaks of himself as the "only-begotten Son" of God, thus differentiating his sonship from that of all others. It is as son that he knows the Father and reveals him to men, that he is the medium through whom the Father gives life to men, that he executes judgment on behalf of the Father.

He is inherently and essentially the Son of God "whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world"; he is officially the Messiah whose coming had been foretold by the prophets. Wherefore he freely applied to himself the Messianic predictions and references in the Old Testament. "They are they which testify of me," he said of the Scriptures as known and read in his day. In the Book of Enoch and certain Rabbinic documents there are references to the pre-mundane existence of the Messiah. Whether the con-

ception in the minds of these writers was that of an ideal or a personal and conscious preëxistence is far more than can be definitely determined. We know, however, that Jesus makes claim to a conscious existence antedating the creation of the world. He horrified certain of his auditors who boasted of their descent from Abraham when he said: "Before Abraham came into being (*γενέσθαι*) I am (*εἰμί*) and in his high priestly prayer, in which we get the clearest insight into his own consciousness, he speaks of the glory which he had with the Father "before the world was."

Jesus styled himself "the Son of Man." It would not be feasible in this connection to enter upon a discussion of the history and association of this phrase in canonic and apocryphal literature; but, as applied by Jesus to himself, the term has a manifest Messianic connotation. As Son of Man he claimed prerogatives which even Moses the lawgiver and David the greatest of Israel's kings never dared to assume. The Son of man has authority to forgive sins, is Lord of the Sabbath, has authority over the angels, and shall sit in glory upon the throne of the consummated kingdom.

(3) *The Kingdom.* By no means the least important of the lessons taught by him who was called "Teacher and Lord" is his doctrine of the Kingdom. The phrase "Kingdom of [God] Heaven," which served at once as fitting vehicle to convey his thought and as psychological stratagem to capture the attention of his auditors, was not of his own coinage. It was appropriated from the religious vernacular of his day. In the Talmudic literature, which presumably reflects the Jewish ideas of the time of Jesus, the phrase *מלכות שמים* is of frequent occurrence. It is the opinion of Edersheim that, while there is a difference of "spirit" between the New Testament and contemporary Jewish thought as revealed in

the Targums and Talmud, "the form in which the idea of the Kingdom of Heaven is presented is substantially similar." But from the request of the sons of Zebedee for positions of honor and trust in relation to the King and the interrogation of the Twelve concerning the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, it is clear that the disciples associated the ideas of organization and territory with the Kingdom; and, as they could not have gotten such ideas from their Teacher, the inference is that they held these views in common with their former co-religionists. It would appear from the controversies between Jesus and his opponents that their conception of the requisites to the enjoyment of the benefits of the Kingdom was altogether different from his.

By the phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" he means the Messianic dispensation as viewed in its correlative aspects of sovereignty exacting allegiance of men and magnanimity insuring blessing to men; adapted in its method to the nature and conditions of mankind, and presenting the phenomena of growth and consumption. Now he speaks of one aspect, now of another; now of the Kingdom in its final issue, now as subject to the laws of growth and development. The jurisdiction of the Kingdom over men issues from the fact that God himself is King, and his Son, the Messiah, is Vicegerent. The duty thus incumbent upon men takes precedence of all earthly obligations. One must be willing, if occasion should arise, to leave house, wife, brothers, parents, and children, for the sake of the Kingdom. The blessing offered is the *summum bonum* in the category of spiritual benefits. Entrance into the Kingdom, which is conditioned upon conformity to certain requirements of character and conduct, is tantamount to eternal salvation. Its growth is analogous to the growth of the mustard seed or the diffusion of the yeast

through the flour. Its method in dealing with men is set forth in the parables of the dragnet and the tares of the field. It is the Kingdom in its eschatological glory, in which the many who come from the four points of the compass shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The inauguration of this period of ultimate triumph, when the angels shall gather out of the Kingdom all things that "cause stumbling" and them that do iniquity, and the righteous shall enter upon their inheritance, shall be synchronous with the end of the world (Matt. xiii. 41 ff.; xxv. 31 ff.).

With that singular prescience by which he could predict the denial by Peter and the betrayal by Judas, Jesus could foresee the spread of his doctrines through the faithful labors of his apostles and their successors, but he was none the less grieved at the contrariety of the men of his own generation toward his message. On that great "day of controversy," that is, Tuesday of the week of his passion, he pronounced fearful woes upon the teaching constituency of Jerusalem, who had, until the end, withstood him and his message, who were "shutting up the Kingdom of Heaven against men"; but the pathetic expression of commiseration with which he closed this series of woes indicates that he spoke out of an intense pity for men so negligent of their own welfare, rather than a feeling of personal revenge.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE DECIDING VOICE OF THE MONUMENTS IN BIBLICAL CRITICISM. By MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., Lecturer on Biblical Archæology in Xenia Theological Seminary, Archæological Editor of the Sunday School Times, etc. 8vo. Pp. 335. Oberlin, Ohio: Bibliotheca Sacra Company. 1912. \$1.50, *net*.

In a more formal way than ever before, the conservative views regarding the Old Testament are here supported by a most competent archæologist, whose contributions to Egyptology have attracted the attention of scholars on both sides of the Atlantic, and whose conclusions have been generally accepted by them. Dr. Melvin G. Kyle is no novice in biblical archæology rehearsing scrappy, second-hand information gathered from books. He has seen with his own eyes the mysteries of the desert and of Sinai, has critically studied almost every corner of Palestine, and has spent many seasons in the "Oriental atmosphere." But his special field is in Egyptian archæology, with a first-hand knowledge of the significance of Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions. He has spent several seasons in research work in the field. The first article of this number of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA gives an account of his association during the past season with Professor Petrie in the great work inaugurated at Heliopolis.

In the book before us, Dr. Kyle has presented a more comprehensive treatment of the bearings of archæology upon the criticism of the Old Testament than has ever before been given, and has furnished a volume which, in its completeness, lucidity of style, accuracy in statements of facts and convincing power of reasoning from them, is a handbook that no student of the subject can afford to neglect.

Part I. treats of the function of archæology in criticism.

After reading it, one cannot but be astonished at the neglect which has been accorded to the subject by most modern critics. Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible and the *Encyclopædia Biblica* have no articles upon the subject. The Catholic Encyclopedia, the Jewish Encyclopedia, and the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia give only inadequate attention to the subject: while the leading destructive critics of the Old Testament have, without exception, moved round in their circular orbit, paying but little attention to the archæological discoveries which were abundantly calculated to enlarge their horizon and correct their rash conclusions.

It goes without saying that Oriental literature can be properly studied only in light of its contemporary environment. But, as Eerdmans forcibly remarks, the prevalent higher criticism is "in every respect a product of Western thought. Western logic, Western combination, which has often forgotten that the history of religions and the living Orient were contradictory to the principles of the critical theories." It is archæology that furnishes us the means of properly interpreting Oriental language. It therefore behooves every Bible student to listen to its teachings. As our author says, "No theory of biblical criticism is to be finally accepted and made a part of faith and life until tested and attested by archæological facts."

Part II. treats of a most important list of controverted questions concerning Old Testament history and interpretation which are settled by archæology. Among these we may mention the location of the Garden of Eden, the correctness of the ethnological tables in the tenth chapter of Genesis, the conditions in Egypt under the Hyksos kings, which shows the history of Joseph and the patriarchs and their descendants in Egypt to be not only credible, but in entire accordance with the political conditions of the times. Archæology also abundantly confirms the existence of the conditions implied in the history of Abraham and in the story of Melchizedek, and discredits the supposed semibarbarous condition of Palestine in patriarchal times and the mythical theories concerning many

of the earlier narratives of the Bible. It sustains the historical character of Genesis xiv., supports the importance of Moses as a lawgiver, and sheds a remarkable light upon the Pentateuchal question and upon the reconstructive theories, and so on through a long list of critical misconceptions. Dr. Kyle significantly says: "As far as the process of testing critical theories of the Bible by archæological facts has been carried to the present time, archæology is bringing criticism into harmony with Scripture at its face value and is not definitely and unequivocally encouraging attempts at literary reconstruction of any portion of the Bible, though sometimes asked to render such service."

In Part III. we find a most lucid and able treatment of the light shed by archæology upon, among many other questions, the dispersion of mankind, the source and course of Semitic culture, Babylonian influence in Canaan, Hebrew slavery in Egypt, the tabernacle in the wilderness, the genealogical lists, with the moral descent from the legislation of the wilderness to the life of the judges and the sudden emergence of the brilliant period of the monarchy, the times of the conquests, the political horizon of the two kingdoms around the circle of the nations, Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Syria, Assyria, and Babylonia. Here, again, our author speaks with no uncertain sound: "Rightly to adjust ourselves between Israel's transcendent importance as the depository of revelation and the channel of the world's hope of salvation, and Israel's international insignificance and the oft-repeated humiliation of her sovereignty as the football of empires is the great problem of the comparison between Bible history and archæological results in Bible lands."

For want of space, however, we must content ourselves with this very incomplete list of the topics treated in this most able, interesting, and satisfactory volume. No one who neglects to read and study it can have an adequate comprehension of the support which the conservative views of the Old Testament receive from recent explorations and scholarly discussion of archæological discoveries.

PENTATEUCHAL STUDIES. By HAROLD M. WIENER, M.A., LL.B., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law; author of "The Origin of the Pentateuch," "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," etc. 8vo. Pp. xvi, 353. Oberlin, Ohio: Bibliotheca Sacra Company; London: Elliot Stock. 1912.

This new volume of essays on Pentateuchal problems by Mr. Wiener is destined, like the previous ones, to create a profound impression in all scholarly circles. The groundwork for his subsequent writings was already securely laid in the author's "Studies in Biblical Law," issued soon after his admission to the bar, instigated, as he tells us, by his reading of Maine's "Ancient Law," which impressed upon him the importance of legal knowledge as a preparation for a proper understanding of the Pentateuch; for the Pentateuch is not ordinary literature, but the work of a statesman dealing with a great variety of practical affairs. Mr. Wiener's "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" and "Origin of the Pentateuch," which followed in due succession, are recognized by some of the best scholars of Germany, Holland, England, and America as marking an epoch in the understanding of Pentateuchal problems. Troelstra, Dahse, Griffiths, and Toy all bear witness to the importance of Mr. Wiener's work. In "Pentateuchal Studies," just issued, the author displays a versatility of mind, a breadth of scholarship, and a profound understanding of legal, social, and religious problems which must command the admiration and the close attention of every scholarly reader. A large part of the volume consists of articles printed in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA: namely, "Some Aspects of the Conservative Task in Pentateuchal Criticism"; "Textual Criticism, History, and Faith"; "The Dating of Genesis xxii."; "The Age of Isaac"; "The Post-Mosaica of Genesis"; "The Answer of Textual Criticism to the Higher Criticism of the Story of Joseph"; "The Swansong of the Wellhausen School"; "The Higher Critical Quandary: A Correspondence with Drs. Briggs, Driver, and Gordon"; "Dr. Driver on Exodus"; "The Negeb in Exodus"; "The 'King' of Deuteronomy xvii. 14-20"; "Deuteronomy xxxiii. 4: 'Moses commanded us a law'"; "The Altar of Joshua xxii."; "The

‘Priests’ of Exodus xix.”; “Priests and Levites: The Fourth Chapter of Wellhausen’s Prolegomena”; “The High Priest”; and “The Fifth Chapter of Wellhausen’s Prolegomena.”

The remaining portion consists of articles which have appeared in the *Princeton Theological Review*, namely, “The Laws of Deuteronomy and the Arguments from Silence” and “Deuteronomy and the Argument from Style,” and a paper read before the Victoria Institute of London, “The Legislations of Israel and Babylonia,” being a comparison of the laws of Hammurabi with those of Moses. These additional essays, together with the preface and the full indexes, will specially commend the volume to the readers of the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, who already have a considerable portion of its contents in their back volumes. The convenience of the present form is worth more than the cost of the volume to those who have the matter in other forms. To the wider circle of biblical students, this volume, with the previous ones mentioned, is an absolute necessity if they would speak with any authority upon Pentateuchal problems. The Wellhausen school are fairly driven off the field, and the conservative views regarding the authorship and significance of the Pentateuchal literature are reestablished in their main particulars, though freed from many misapprehensions and embarrassing lines of defense.

GESCHICHTE DER ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN RELIGION KRITISCH DARGESTELLT. By EDUARD KÖNIG. Pp. viii, 608. Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann. 1912. M. 7, paper; M. 8, bound.

A foreign reviewer reading a work of this character almost instinctively adopts a standpoint that differs considerably from the natural angle of vision of a native. Professor König has a reputation that is unusual even in Germany for thoroughness and staying power. He is also conservative in a degree which, if not particularly noteworthy when judged by any reasonable absolute standard, is at any rate remarkable in the Germany of to-day, and this work shows us both these

qualities operating to their fullest extent. Indeed, it would be difficult to find a book that more accurately mirrors German Old Testament theology in its strongest and best aspects than the present volume, and accordingly the foreign reviewer tends to interrogate the work as to the present condition of these studies in Germany. The answer is not satisfactory. Dr. König's own virtues only tend to emphasize the more clearly the undeniable fact that German Old Testament studies are suffering from a most grave disease, and require drastic remedies if they are to be brought to a state of convalescence in any measurable distance of time. The truth is that, in addition to certain defects that result from the differences in the national character of the Germans and the Jews whose literature these students are trying to comprehend, there are other causes, to which Dr. König bears testimony that is not the less eloquent for being entirely unconscious. According to a well-known German *mot*, a professor is a man who is of a different opinion; and, unfortunately, the spirit it indicates is only too rampant in the German universities. Accordingly liberty of research has degenerated into indefensible license; and this, combined with a system of education that entirely omits to train its unfortunate recipients in the weighing or sifting of evidence, is responsible for a state of affairs in which men who are absolutely devoid of any real originality bespatter the Bible with the rubbish of their brains, with the most undesirable consequences. It is with this state of affairs that Professor König is concerned; and this is one of the features that lend interest to his book in foreign eyes. For instance, he finds it necessary to devote no less than two pages to proving that Abraham was not an old stone deity (pp. 82-84). Or take another example: in 2 Samuel xviii. 18 we read of Absalom's erecting a pillar. A German writer has been found to suggest that this is a proof of ancestor-worship. Following Grüneisen, Dr. König pertinently inquires how a *massebah* was to set about invoking Absalom (p. 56). The reply is of course unanswerable; but what is to be said of the condition of theological schools in which such theories can be gravely

put forward and require to be answered by a professor of Dr. König's caliber? But while such reflections inevitably suggest themselves, it is just this feature of the book that lends it especial value for conservative scholars in English-speaking countries. It is unfortunately the case that we are inundated with literature that is devoted to the propagation of just such views as these, and it is a great advantage to be able to point to a book in which large numbers of such theories are fully considered and convincingly answered.

Dr. König's work is, unfortunately, marred by his neglect of textual criticism and of the assistance which scientific legal and historical work can render to any inquirer into any branch of historical study. Of the former I do not propose to speak; for I am glad to say that I have reason to suppose that Germany is at last waking up to the importance of textual criticism, so that our author will shortly hear enough about its necessity in his own country. But I would take this opportunity of commending the latter to his notice. I do not suppose that if Dr. König wished for information on some difficult point of German law he would either trust to his own knowledge or seek the advice of a Germanic philologist. He would probably consult a lawyer, on the ground that special training and knowledge were essential for the formation of a sound judgment on the question at issue, and in so doing he would merely be following the common practice of men of sense. I have never been able to understand why the teachings of universal experience should be absolutely neglected by theologians studying the Bible; and I would venture to suggest to Dr. König that it would enable him to correct many of the views expressed in his book, and also to find additional corroboration for many others, if he would read carefully the sixth chapter of my "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism" and the article on "Priests and Levites" in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for July, 1910.

The author has undoubtedly expended an enormous amount of labor on the production of the book, and he has by no means neglected English works. One misses references to
Vol. LXIX. No. 276. 11

the books of R. H. Charles and S. Schechter, and it is a great pity that Dr. König has not read Mr. J. S. Griffiths's valuable "Problem of Deuteronomy." On the whole, the volume may be heartily commended to those who may wish to see what can be said on the conservative side by a singularly able and learned adherent of the moribund documentary theory.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

London, England.

ALTTESTAMENTLICHE STUDIEN. By B. D. EERDMANS, ordentlicher Professor der Theologie in Leiden. IV. DAS BUCH LEVITICUS. Pp. iv, 144. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann. 1912.

This is the fourth of the series in which Professor Eerdmans attacks the critical theories that are generally current and seeks to replace them by new theories of his own. The preceding volumes were reviewed in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA for October, 1909, and July, 1910.

While this volume shares the characteristics of its predecessors, it differs from them in being on the whole very much better. In reading the book it is difficult not to feel that the author is a misplaced conservative. If he were not separated from conservatism by his early training and a fixed idea about polytheism, I think he must have seen that many of his own arguments point logically to the Mosaic age, and no other, as the date of the composition of the laws. As it is, he fails in many cases to see where he is going. But the conservatives will be clearer-sighted. To the present reviewer the book is particularly gratifying, for Eerdmans puts forward independently many arguments that have already appeared in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA. Indeed, with the reservations already noted, the book is likely to provide conservative scholars with a storehouse of ammunition for some time to come, and it should be carefully studied by all who are interested in the Pentateuchal problem.

HAROLD M. WIENER.

ZUR EINLEITUNG IN DAS ALTE TESTAMENT. By CARL HEINRICH CORNILL. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1912. M. 3.

This book has been written in consequence of the appearance of Sellin's "Einleitung." Cornill regarded the book as a kind of challenge to him as the author of a widely circulated critical introduction representing the Wellhausen theories in an advanced form, and accordingly wrote the present volume for the purpose of discussing in detail certain points of difference. If Cornill's standpoint is possible, he in some instances makes a good case against Sellin; but the great difficulty one feels in reading the book is that Cornill makes no attempt whatever to justify his method. Over four years ago Wellhausen himself admitted to Dahse that in an article published in 1903 he had treated of a sore point of the documentary theory. He has now given permission for this to be published. What was the sore point? It was the textual evidence as to the Divine appellations in Genesis. Now that alone is merely one illustration of the textual method. If textual criticism be right and legitimate, it cannot be confined to certain words, but must be exercised throughout the Pentateuch as the first step towards obtaining a basis for scholarly study. Wellhausen himself first made a reputation by a critical examination of the text of the books of Samuel, and it is therefore only natural that he should recognize that the methods which are applicable to the text of Samuel must also apply to the text of the Pentateuch. And what is Cornill's position on the point? I have searched the book in vain for any statement of his attitude towards the textual criticism of the Pentateuch. And yet his position resembles Wellhausen's in that he too first made a reputation by the textual treatment of an Old Testament book. His edition of Ezekiel marked a stage in the critical study of the text of that author's writings. What, then, has he to say on the subject of the Pentateuchal text? For instance, on page 22 he recognizes that in Ezekiel xxxvii. 22 and 24 "prince" is to be read instead of the Masoretic "king." This view was taken in the *BIBLIOTHECA SACRA* for July, 1911, and I am glad to see that Cornill has

reached it independently. But then if this reasoning applies to Ezekiel, why does it not apply to Deuteronomy? If the LXX did not know of a king in the so-called law of the kingdom, how can it be right to ignore its evidence? This of course is merely a single example, and the readers of this Review are too familiar with the bearings and importance of the textual method for further instances to be desirable in this place; but the line of reasoning goes to the root of Cornill's whole position. Unless he believes in the infallibility of the scribes who have transmitted the Massoretic text of the Pentateuch, he is building on foundations of sand.

It is not possible here to deal with the minutiae of Cornill's opinions, but I note that, unlike most of the Wellhausen critics, he repudiates the view that all slaughter was sacrificial (pp. 36 f.). But there is one aspect of his book that must not be overlooked. On pages 2 f. he takes up an attitude that is not easy to understand by grouping together all sorts of opinions on manifold points with the documentary and evolutionary theories. It does not seem to have occurred to him that a man might, e.g., think a reading of the Massoretic text in, say, Judges corrupt or hold a particular view as to the meaning of a passage in Job, and yet not accept sweeping theories as to the composition of other Old Testament books on which these particular passages have no bearing. H. M. W.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL UNDER THE KINGDOM. The Kerr Lectures, Delivered in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, during Session 1911-12. By the Rev. ADAM C. WELCH, Theol.D., author of "Anselm and his Work." 8vo. Pp. xv, 305. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1912.

The worth of this otherwise valuable volume is greatly diminished by the numerous misconceptions and misstatements of facts arising from the author's general acceptance of the prevailing higher critical views concerning the Pentateuch. Thus we find him (pp. 30, 31) transforming lay altars into "sanctuaries," and representing that the Hebrew servant who had his ear bored against a doorpost did this at a "sanctuary"; whereas the statement is, that he was taken not to the

sanctuary but to the "judges" (which, in this case, as in several others, is, doubtless, the significance of *elohim*; see Ex. xxii. 8, 9, 38). The error appears more prominently upon the next page, where it is said that the three great festivals mentioned in Ex. xxiii. 14-19 were celebrated at "the great sanctuaries"; whereas it is expressly said that the sacrifices connected with this festival were to be brought to the "house of the Lord thy God" (see also Ex. xxxiv. 26). All this has been made plain enough by Mr. Wiener's discussions, which should not be overlooked by any one who ventures to express an opinion on the subject. This fault of the author appears in an aggravated form in the discussion of the book of Deuteronomy, which he maintains could be legitimately claimed by the compilers to be Mosaic, "just as the Nicene fathers could call the creed which they framed Christian and could claim for it the authority of the apostles" (p. 215). Overlooking the distinction between lay sacrifices, which were, as Mr. Wiener has abundantly shown, permitted anywhere in Palestine, provided they were offered upon an altar of earth or unhewn stone (see Ex. xx. 24-26; Deut. xvi. 21-22), Dr. Welch represents Deuteronomy as making "a deliberate effort to suppress the local sacrifices of clan and family, and that with this end in view it was determined that private sacrifices should be permitted only at the central sanctuary." The author's reference to Deut. xii. 13-19, 27, is irrelevant, since the sacrifices there referred to are, in view of the whole historical background, to be considered not as referring to customary lay sacrifices, but to the statutory offerings to be taken to the central place of sacrifice, which all along were offered at Shiloh and later at Jerusalem.

For a comprehensive, convincing discussion of this point, see Wiener's "Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism," pp. 193-197.

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND EARLY CRITICISMS (A Work of Negation). By A. S. GARRETSON. 12mo. Pp. xii, 300. Boston: Sherman, French and Company. 1912.

An ostentatious attempt at negative criticism by a treatment of evidence which would make it impossible for any

one to prove the legitimacy of his own birth. The author maintains, that "any proposition outside and beyond human experience and understanding cannot be accepted with safety or confidence" (p. 5). How does he know that the miraculous conception of Christ is "outside of human experience"? That it is "beyond human understanding" is no more true than it is of every human birth. In the body of the book we find that many of his statements are clearly incorrect, and that almost every confident assertion of fact is on doubtful authority, and needs to be carefully scanned by an expert.

A HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE FROM BEOWULF TO SWINBURNE. By ANDREW LANG, M.A., Hon. Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Pp. xxi, 689. London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1912. 5s., net.

The world of letters has lost a notable personality and a brilliant critic in the death of Andrew Lang. His output was enormous in quantity, and greatly diversified in character. One almost wishes he had done less, and used his powers only for their highest. He will perhaps be as much remembered for the work before us, as by anything he has done in other directions. It is much, very much indeed, to have the whole compass of English Literature gone over by one with his lightness of touch, personal note of flavor, and varied attractive qualities. His distinctive qualities shine most conspicuously in this valuable volume. The sections dealing with early Anglo-Saxon Literature and the Mediæval Period certainly never received more interesting or readable treatment. As much might also be said of his handling from Chaucer on through Elizabethan and Jacobean Literature. Of course, his characterizations are sometimes disappointing, as, for example, his remark on Herrick's "Litany to the Holy Spirit," but it is redeemed by his happy remark that Herrick's sacred poems "show an almost unregenerate happiness." Earlier in the work are excellent things, such as the treatment of Layamon, and of Henryson's "Testament of Cresseide," wherein "there are but 616 lines; and it contains the poignant essence of romance; all passion and pity." Admirable, too, is the

treatment of Spenser, later, which, in its close, has these passages: "The spoils of all old poetry are mingled with his own." "His successors have taken from him his very tones." "English poetry fell with the neglect of Spenser." "English poetry came fully to her own again when the magic book of Spenser was opened by Keats." When at length our author comes to deal with the literature of the nineteenth century, it is to give us the most individualistic, original, and powerful survey that has come from any one's hands. The treatment of Tennyson is touchingly beautiful at the close; the criticism of Arnold very good; that of Meredith strikingly characteristic; and that of Swinburne most welcome and valuable. Indeed, the work as a whole can only be pronounced as of perennial value and interest.

The good wine, however, is not being kept to the last. The most unsatisfactory thing, by far, in this work is its treatment of American literature. Bryant, Whittier, Longfellow, Poe; there is not one of them for whom it would not be easy to say more at least than is said here, although "originality of tone and touch" is vouchsafed to Poe. But it is in the critic's treatment of Emerson and Lowell that his limitations in power to appreciate are most seen. In the case of Emerson, one must demur to the judgment of Mr. Lang, when he, a critic of caliber, leaves Emerson's position, as poet and essayist, to his own countrymen as matter of dispute. It appears to me palpable nonsense to write thus. Emerson's place in *American* letters may be for his countrymen, but Emerson's place in the world of letters—of the great English-speaking peoples—is an *international* affair, not at all confined to his own countrymen; and Mr. Lang seems to me unaccountably foolish in regarding himself as an "alien" in such matters. He quotes Professors Barrett Wendell and Trent, of Harvard and Columbia Universities—both competent authorities, beyond doubt—but I should not dream of taking their judgments, or even that of Matthew Arnold, on Emerson, particularly as an essayist, as any reason for not forming a judgment of my own. The blunt truth is, that Emerson, with

every defect, has at least a place in the world of letters such as to make the judgments of this capable trio of critics a matter of infinitely less moment than Andrew Lang supposed. If Mr. Lang had known his Emerson in any thorough fashion, he would not have been, for an instant, content to delegate the making of a judgment to anybody. The self-effacement is quite out of keeping with the rest of the volume. Lowell also is criticized in a quite inadequate and unsatisfactory manner, but I shall say no more on the subject, having, in a recent essay of my own, treated "The Poetry of Lowell" with some more just appreciation ("Literary Essays," Blackwood, 1912) than is to be found here.

JAMES LINDSAY.

Irvine, Scotland.

THE PROMISE OF THE CHRIST-AGE IN RECENT LITERATURE.

By WILLIAM EUGENE MOSHER, Ph.D. 12mo. Pp. v, 175.
New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1912. \$1.25,
net.

In this admirable summary of ten popular works of fiction widely read on the Continent we have an impressive confirmation of the saying of the Evangelist, that Christ could not be hid. It certainly is remarkable that there is a demand in Europe for works of fiction which attempt to idealize the character and work of Jesus. Though dealing somewhat freely, as most of them do, with the text of the Gospels, the character of Christ is made to shine out in a manner which throws into a shadow all other characters. The author has done the English-speaking world good service in bringing these works to their notice.

GREECE AND BABYLON: A Comparative Sketch of Mesopotamian, Anatolian, and Hellenic Religions. By LEWIS R. FARNELL, D.Litt., M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford; author of "Cults of the Greek States," "Evolution of Religion," "Higher Aspects of Greek Religion" (Hibbert Lectures). 8vo. Pp. xii, 311. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

The main body of this volume is devoted to the discussion

of the alleged dependence of Greece upon Babylonia for her religious conceptions. This question is elaborately discussed from every point of view, and the conclusion is reached, that, so far "as our knowledge goes at present, there is no reason for believing that nascent Hellenism, wherever else arose the streams that nourished its spiritual life, was fertilized by the deep springs of Babylonian religion or theosophy" (p. 307).

The evidence bearing upon the subject is mostly drawn from the literature and archæology of the second millennium before Christ, during which period, as the author believes, the Hittites formed an almost inseparable barrier between Babylonia and Greece. The religion of the Greeks is supposed to have been derived from that of the Aryan-speaking tribes, who penetrated Greece from the Balkans about 1500 B.C. The Pan-Babylonians will find in this volume much to make them pause and reconsider their theories.

THE SCHOOL IN THE HOME: Talks with Parents and Teachers on Intensive Child Training. By A. A. BERLE, A.M., D.D., Professor of Applied Christianity in Tufts College. 12mo. Pp. 210. New York: Moffat, Yard and Company. 1912. \$1.00, *net*.

A strong indictment of present-day methods of education, and a powerful plea for more enlightened methods of home training. The chapters on "Mind Fertilization," "The Elimination of Waste," and "Harnessing the Imagination" are specially suggestive. "An unharnessed imagination is the best soil possible for every kind of moral delinquency, but it is also the effective agent of mental inefficiency" (p. 134).

CUMORAH REVISITED; or, "The Book of Mormon" and the Claims of the Mormons Re-examined from the Viewpoint of American Archæology and Ethnology. By CHARLES A. SHOOK. 8vo. Pp. 589. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company.

A valuable and well-nigh exhaustive refutation of the Mormon claims to authenticity respecting the origin and history of the tribes of North America. The author, however, is, we believe, in error in attributing too much to the influence of

Solomon Spaulding's writings. There seems to us no adequate evidence that Spaulding wrote anything else than "The Manuscript Found," which, after disappearing for half a century, was discovered by President Fairchild among the effects of Mr. E. D. Howe, editor of the Painesville (Ohio) *Telegraph*, into whose hands it was traced while composing his book "Mormonism Unveiled."

WAS CHRIST DIVINE? By WILLIAM W. KINSLEY, author of "Man's Tomorrow," "Does Prayer Avail," "Views on Vexed Questions," "Old Faiths and New Facts," etc. 12mo. Pp. 144. Boston: Sherman, French and Company. 1912. \$1.00, *net*.

The strongest point in this very readable volume will be found in the author's development of the first part of his argument, which relates to the question, "Is the human race of sufficient worth to warrant such condescension and sacrifice on God's part as were displayed in Christ?" One cannot read this portion without feeling that man stands apart from all other created intelligences, both in his mental powers and in his bodily organization. So powerfully is this presented, that it is easy to credit all that is revealed in the Bible concerning God's manifestation, through Christ, of interest in man's salvation. The author's theory concerning the person of Christ finds its nearest classification in Nestorianism, the mysteries of which are as deep as those of the more strictly orthodox theories. The book is written in admirable style and is very stimulating.

THE FUNDAMENTALS: A Testimony to the Truth. Vol. IX. Pp. 127. Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company. Compliments of Two Christian Laymen.

This volume contains, among others, articles on "The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch," by Dr. G. Frederick Wright, and "Holy Scripture and Modern Negation," by Dr. James Orr. As implied on the title-page, copies can be had gratis by addressing the publishers, at 808 La Salle Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

THE ONLY WAY: A CORRESPONDENCE.

THE following is a copy of a letter that has been sent to a correspondent:—

9 OLD SQUARE,
LINCOLN'S INN, W. C.
29 August 1912.

My dear Sir:—

Dr. Wright has forwarded me your letter of the 24th ult. with a request that I should write to you on the subject with which it deals. Owing to absence from town I have been unable to do so before, but I now have much pleasure in answering your point.

I understand you to say that in your opinion the attacks on the personal character of the critics are bad tactics, and you tell me that one conservative agrees with you. Now it happens that Dr. Wright and I have at our disposal knowledge which we are unable to reveal as to the effectiveness of the tactics I have adopted, and to that extent it is impossible for me to give you a complete answer; but I can at any rate tell you a good deal without violating any confidence. I do so the more readily because I have great sympathy with your point of view which I shared before I knew so much about the critical methods. In my "Studies in Biblical Law" I actually wrote as follows:—"Nobody will question the excellence of their intentions; nobody will suggest that any critic would willingly be guilty of the slightest falsehood." Today I can no longer say so. While there are a few honourable men among the higher critics, the majority of them are men who are utterly unscrupulous where the documentary theory is concerned, and do not hesitate to adopt methods that would not be tolerated in any honourable profession.

My first lesson in this came to me through my first book. I found that even in signed reviews there was no hesitation about misrepresenting my statements, alleging that I had

said what I had expressly repudiated and so on. Since then I have experienced one dishonourable act after another and I believe that the great majority of really experienced conservatives agree with me that the present methods — unpleasant as they are — are the only ones that do any good at all. As a rule it is not possible so to separate the various elements as to be able to say definitely that without the charge of dishonesty the results would have been different, but it happens that the conduct of Dr. Driver has furnished me with an unmistakable example. In his case we are dealing with a man in whose personal honesty I struggled to believe for many years, so that the instance is peculiarly instructive. Further the matter is involved with circumstances that show very clearly the true value of the soft answer that you desiderate in dealing with the critics, so that I feel justified in asking you to examine the facts.

In January 1909, as you doubtless remember, I published an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* on Astruc's clue. This led to some discussion in the *Expository Times* in which Dr. Skinner deliberately misrepresented the facts. I replied with a note which was a most striking example of the soft answer. If your view of the critics had been correct Dr. Skinner would have told the truth thereafter and perhaps also have apologised for his misconduct. Nothing of the sort happened. Dr. Skinner on the contrary proceeded deliberately to misrepresent the facts and deceive the public. What did Dr. Driver do? Some months after the appearance of my article he published a fresh edition of his *Genesis* (the seventh) in which he took no notice whatever of my facts and arguments. Later I wrote to the general editors of the *International Critical Commentary* charging Dr. Skinner with dishonesty, and in the very next month Dr. Driver wrote an addendum for the following (eighth) edition of his *Genesis* in which he took cognisance of my facts and arguments — *but only of those in respect of which I had charged Dr. Skinner with dishonesty, carefully omitting all notice of the other points in the same article.* Needless to say, my facts and arguments were

exactly the same when Dr. Driver was preparing his seventh edition as when he was preparing his eighth, and he was fully cognisant of them, for I had sent him the original article on its appearance and he is a regular reader of the *Expository Times*. The only difference was that in the interval I had made the charge of dishonesty coupled with the threat of publication, and Dr. Driver rendered to this an amount of attention that no facts or arguments could obtain from him. It would be impossible to show more clearly what considerations move the critics. Of the validity of the points urged there can be no doubt whatever, for Wellhausen himself, the head of the documentary school, has recently admitted that the textual evidence of the versions as to Astruc's clue is a sore point of the theory. You will remember that the critics used always to claim that their theory was invulnerable.

The fact of the matter is that when you have to deal with people who are unscrupulous, you must use methods that would be absolutely unjustifiable if one were concerned with honourable gentlemen. Drs. Driver and Skinner have done things that would not be tolerated in any honourable profession. The officer of the army or navy who used his position for the purpose of deceiving the public would have to leave the service. The barrister who acted in this fashion would be disbarred. I apprehend that if an elementary teacher in a Sunday School announced his intention of teaching about the Bible what he knew or believed to be false the competent authorities would speedily dispense with his services. But in the view of these men theological professors may indulge in such conduct. I say "in the view of these men" because this is not the universal opinion of theological teachers. Thus I have never heard it suggested that Dr. Driver's immediate predecessor in the Hebrew chair, Dr. Pusey, would ever have behaved as his successor does. As I write there lies before me a pamphlet entitled AUDIATUR ET ALTERA PARS by Professor Schlögl of Vienna which has only recently been published. In the preface he explains that he cannot and dare not pass a direct attack on his honour "to which in my

twofold position as an academic teacher and a priest of a Catholic Order I must perhaps attach even more importance before God and men than another." Yet the charge that elicits such a declaration is merely one of plagiarism, a far less serious matter than deliberate deceit. No clearheaded man of the world who reads my article in the April number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* can doubt that its appearance must have been immediately followed by proceedings if the critics had not known that they were hopelessly guilty, and that if once they went into the witness-box they would leave it as broken men. As it is, the discussion in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* is being followed in various parts of the world by men who realise the exact issues at stake and the nature of the position, and there is reason to believe that my campaign will have the desired effect. No other course is open in dealing with men who rely on dishonest means, except for those who are content to retire from the contest because they are opposed by foul methods or who will acquiesce in being utterly ineffective.

I have purposely refrained from adducing either the increase in the circulation of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* or the eagerness with which eminent foreign scholars now seek admission to its pages as arguments on my side because I feel that the justification for my conduct really rests on the peculiar characters of the critics which necessitate these methods.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD M. WIENER.

INDEX

A

Americanism, Catholicism and, article on, by A. Bierbower, 269-287.

B

Bartlett, S. C., article by, 100-114.

Beecher's, W. J., Reasonable Biblical Criticism, noticed, 409-420.

Berle's, A. A., School in the Home, noticed, 721.

Bewer's, J. A., Commentary on Obadiah and Joel, noticed, 464.

Biblical and Theological Studies, noticed, 530-532.

Biblical Criticism, Reasonable, article on, by W. H. G. Thomas, 409-420.

Bierbower, A., article by, 269-287.

Bishop's, W. S., Development of Trinitarian Doctrine in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, 370.

Bliss's, F. J., Religions of Modern Syria and Palestine, noticed, 544.

Boardman, G. N., articles by, 185-221, 618-641.

Boas', F., Mind of Primitive Man, noticed, 182.

Bonner, D. F., article by, 492-512.

Brown's, A. J., Chinese Revolution, noticed, 538.

Brown's, C. R., Modern Man's Religion, noticed, 372.

Buddhism in Japan, The Revival of, article on, by S. C. Bartlett, 100-114; Buddhist enthusiasm in Japan, 100; opinion of Japanese scholars, 101; defense of Buddhism, 103; popular preaching of

Buddhists, 105; two views of the "Adoration," 108; influence of Hōnen Shōnin, 110; resemblance to Christianity, 114.

C

Cadman's, S. P., Charles Darwin and Other English Thinkers, noticed, 183.

Campbell, G., poem by, 549.

Case's, S. J., Historicity of Jesus, noticed, 533.

Catholicism and Americanism, article on, by A. Bierbower, 269-287; Roman Catholic Church un-American, 269; distinction between the clergy and the people, 270; the divine right of the clergy to rule, 271; upholding slavery, 272; monarchical tendencies, 274; secrecy of clerical rule, 276; the confessional, 278; the *Index Expurgatorius*, 279; opposed to public schools, 281; a foreign element in politics, 283; interference with religious liberty, 286.

Caverno, C., article by, 242-268.

Chapman's, A. T., Introduction to the Pentateuch, noticed, 88-99.

Child's, F. S., Country Parish, noticed, 371.

Christ in the Four Gospels, article on, by E. P. Gardner, 222-241.

Christian Unity. The Scriptural Foundation for, article on, by B. T. Stafford, 55-70; universality of law, 55; the divine society, 57; importance of organization, 58; perpetuation of the Christian ministry, 59; a real apostolic succession,

- 61; significance of baptism, 62; the common brotherhood, 63; importance of physical *media*, 66; the Lord's Supper, 67; men governed by law, 68.
- Christianity and the Industrial Problem, article on, by D. F. Bonner, 492-512; importance of the problem, 492; to be studied inductively, 493; ministry of John the Baptist, 494; personal teaching of Jesus, 495; application to present times, 496; the mission of the Seventy, 497; reciprocal duties of capital and labor, 498; property rights recognized, 499; parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, 500; ministry of the Apostles, 501; duty of servants, 501; of masters, 502; dualism throughout the universe, 503; promotion of faithful laborers, 504; all men either capitalists or laborers, 505; permanent existence of masters and servants, 507; personal relations between the two, 508; reciprocal duties, 509; present industrial system not inconsistent with Christianity, 509; violence out of place in the struggle between capital and labor, 510; importance of Christian public sentiment, 511.
- Christians of Damascus, Sadducean, article on, by G. Margoliouth, 421-437.
- Cooke's, G. A., *Progress of Revelation*, noticed, 172.
- Cornill's, C. H., *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, noticed, 715-716.
- Correspondence, A, 723.
- Correspondence between A. R. Gordon and H. M. Wiener, 349-357.
- Creed, The Bearing of One's Philosophy on, article on, by R. E. Neighbor, 22-34; definition of philosophy, 22; mental bias inevitable, 23; influence of Greek philosophy on the creeds of Christendom, 24; difference between the Eastern and Western mind, 25; philosophy of the Church Fathers, 27; philosophy not to be confounded with life, 28; philosophical doctrine of dualism, 30; importance of tolerance and open-mindedness, 31; of appeal to the New Testament, 32.
- Critical Notes, 136-158, 522-526.
- Criticism, Moderate, article on, by J. S. Griffiths, 88-99; presence of post-Mosaica in the Pentateuch inevitable, 89; style and vocabulary, inconclusive, 90; unity of purpose in the Pentateuch, 91; logical issues of the destructive criticism, 93; rationalism of the critics, 94; date of the Pentateuch important, 96; tradition untrustworthy after a short time, 97; literary standards of honesty of biblical writers, 99.
- Criticism, Pentateuchal, Some Aspects of the Conservative Task in, article on, by H. M. Wiener, 310-328.
- Criticism, Reasonable Biblical, article on, by W. H. G. Thomas, 409-420; W. J. Beecher's volume on, 409; agnostic and cryptoagnostic criticism, 410; are the Scriptures true, 411; importance of historical truth, 412; true theory of inspiration, 413; conservative theories too rigid, 414; prevalent views concerning the Old Testament, 415; accepted principles of criticism, 416; necessity of considering all the evidence, 417; archeological evidence, 418; essential trustworthiness of Old Testament narratives, 419.
- Critics, The Philosophy and Theology of Leading Old Testament, article on, by A. C. Knudson, 1-21.

Currier's, A. H., Present Day Problem of Crime, noticed, 371.

D

Dahse, J., article by, 657-663.

"Deuteronomy: Its Place in Revelation," article on, by H. M. Wiener, 642-656; the divisive critics aroused, 642; Dr. Driver's dilemma, 643; lawfulness of patriarchal altars, 644; misinterpretation of Ex. xxi. 5, 645; reckless statements of the higher critics, 646; Dr. McNeille's uncandid treatment of Mr. Griffiths, 648; failure to understand Jewish social customs, 649; confusion respecting priests and Levites, 650; the law of holiness, 651; mistranslations, 652, 654; the partitive genitive, 653; insignificant discrepancies, 655.

Divorce Law, Do We Want a Uniform, note on, by R. E. Prime, 136-141.

Divorce Problem, The, article on, by C. Caverno, 242-268; Scripture doctrine, 242; Christ's exception to his rule, 247; Paul's position, 252; sociology, 253; Puritans and free divorce, 256; statistics, 258; true Christian altruism, 259; uniform divorce law, 262; importance of family life, 265.

Douglass's, T. O., Pilgrims of, Iowa, noticed, 372.

Drake, A. E., book review by, 358-360.

Driver on Exodus, Dr., note on, by H. M. Wiener, 151-158.

Dujardin's, E., Source of the Christian Tradition, noticed, 543.

Dunning's, A. E., Making of the Bible, noticed, 365.

E

Eerdmans's, B. D., Alttestamentliche Studien, noticed, 714.

Voi. LXIX. No. 276. 12

Evjen's, J., Lutheran Germany and the Book of Concord, noticed, 534.

Evolution, History Not Explained by, note on, 526.

Excavations at Heliopolis, Petrie's, article on, by M. G. Kyle, 553-564.

Exodus, The Negeb in, note on, 345-348.

F

Farnell's, L.R., Greece and Babylon, noticed, 720.

Fisher's, D. W., Calvin Wilson Mateer, noticed, 373.

Foston's, H., Beatitudes and the Contrasts, noticed, 367.

Fullerton, K., book review by, 527-529.

Fundamentals, The, noticed, 722.

G

Gairdner's, J., Lollardy and the Reformation in England, noticed, 173-176.

Gardner, E. P., article by, 222-241.

Garretson's, A. S., Primitive Christianity and Early Criticism, noticed, 717.

Gelser, K. F., translation by, 657-663.

Glazebrook's, M. G., End of the Law, noticed, 361-365.

Gospels, Christ in the Four, article on, by E. P. Gardner, 222-241; Ezekiel's vision, 222; characteristics of Matthew's Gospel, 224; of Mark's, 227; of Luke's, 231; of John's, 234; the fourfold picture, 240.

Gray's, G. N., Commentary on Isaiah, noticed, 480.

Griffiths, J. S., article by, 88-99.

H

Haggard, A. M., article by, 664-692.

Hanson's, G., Resurrection and the Life, noticed, 369.

Harvard Theological Review, Tactics of, 547.

Haydn, H. M., note by, 522-528.
 Heliopolis, Professor Petrie's Excavations at, article on, by M. G. Kyle, 553-564; the biblical On, 553; accumulation of the dust of ages, 554; oasis in the center of the city, 555; rise of the level of the Nile, 556; Professor Petrie's camp, 558; absence of Roman rubbish, 559; scarcity of "finds," 560; the temple area, 561; the building of Rameses II., 562; a Hyksos camp, 563.
 Henson's, P. S., Four Faces, noticed, 183.
 History Not Explained by Evolution, note on, 526.
 Hodge's, G., Everyman's Religion, noticed, 180.
 Hodgkin's, T., Trial of Our Faith, noticed, 367.
 Hoskier's, H. C., Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version, noticed, 165.
 Huizinga, A. v. C. P., article by, 35-54.
 Huizinga's, A. v. C. P., Authority, noticed, 534; Authority of Might and Right, noticed, 534.
 Humphries', A. L., Holy Spirit in Faith and Experience, noticed, 168-170.
 Huntington's, E., Palestine and its Transformation, noticed, 159-163.
 Hyde's, W. D., Five Great Philosophies of Life, noticed, 179.

I

Illingworth's, J. R., Divine Transcendence, noticed, 178.
 Industrial Problem, Christianity and the, article on, by D. F. Bonner, 492-512.
 International Critical Commentary, Two New Volumes of the, article on, by H. M. Wiener, 464-491; disavowal of responsibility by Drs. Briggs and Driver, 466; Drs. Smith and Ward on the Massoretic text, 467; disavowal of biblical ethics, 468; unaccountable de-

lay in completing the series, 469; poor arrangement of matter in Dr. Smith's commentary, 470; honesty of Dr. Smith, 471; size apt to vary inversely with available knowledge, 471; excellent style of Dr. Smith's translation, 472; unfortunate in his fixed ideas, 473; genuine passages in Nahum, few, 474; inconsistencies among the critics, 475; Margolis's Commentary on Micah, commended, 476; Smith's textual criticism, excellent, 477; feebleness of Dr. Ward's commentary, 477; beauty of Dr. Bewer's English, 478; weakness of his higher criticism, 479; his originality, 479; Dr. Gray on Isaiah, 480; his coining of outlandish words, 481; his unnecessary sacrifice of form and style, 482; criticism of the Massoretic text, 482; inadequate use of the materials of textual criticism, 483; Dr. Gray's inability to understand poetry, 485; faked evidence, 486; Dr. Gray's fatal lack of legal knowledge, 487; Hebrew covenants, 488.
 Israel, Religion of, and its Newer Representation, article on, by E. König, 513-521.

J

Jackson's, S. M., New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, noticed, 181, 537.
 Japan, The Revival of Buddhism in, article on, by S. C. Bartlett, 100-114.
 Jastrow's, M., Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria, noticed, 527-529.
 Jesus the Rabbi, article on, by L. Reddin, 693-706; didactic activity of the times, 693; a time of reaction, 694; the nondescript teacher, 695; his

- pedagogy, 696; his ethical message, 699; his religious message, 701; his teachings concerning God, 702; concerning himself, 703; his kingdom, 704.
- Johnson's, F. H., *God in Evolution*, noticed, 177.
- Jones's, R. M., *Quakers in the American Colonies*, noticed, 373-376.
- Josephus, *The Testimony of*, concerning Jesus, article on, by H. M. Magoun, 288-309; history of Josephus, 288; literary activity, 289; opportunity to know the facts, 290; not likely to ignore Christ, 292; claim to impartiality, 293; testimony of Tacitus, 294; the true viewpoint, 295; difficulties of translation, 296; imperfect knowledge of Christ, 297; Jesus a common name, 300; difficulty of forgery, 301; testimony of Eusebius, 302; Origen's omission not conclusive, 304; inaccuracy of quotations from memory, 305; honesty of Josephus, 308.
- K
- Kent's, C. F., *Makers and Teachers of Judaism*, noticed, 373.
- Kidd's, B. J., *Documents of the Continental Reformation*, noticed, 167.
- Kingman's, H., *Way of Honor*, noticed, 183.
- Kinsley's W. W., *Does Prayer Avail*, noticed, 180; *Was Christ Divine*, noticed, 722.
- Knudson, A. C., article by, 1-21.
- König, E., article by, 513-521.
- König, E., *Geschichte der Alttestamentlichen Religion kritisch dargelegt*, noticed, 711-714.
- Kyle, M. G., article by, 553-564; book review by, 366.
- Kyle's, M. G., *Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism*, book review on, 707-709.

L

- Lang's, A., *History of English Literature from Beowulf to Swinburne*, noticed, 718-720.
- La Touche's, E. D., *Person of Christ in Modern Thought*, noticed, 532.
- Lerch, C. H., article by, 71-87.
- Lewis's, G., *Philocalia of Origen*, noticed, 369.
- Lindsay, J., book reviews by, 536, 718-720.

M

- Mac'ulloch's, J. A., *Religion of the Ancient Celt*, noticed, 358-360.
- McNeile's, A. H., *Deuteronomy: Its Place in Revelation*, noticed, 642-656.
- Magoun, H. W., article by, 288-309.
- Margoliouth, G., article by, 421-437.
- Mead, *Tribute to Charles Marsh*, by his Friends, edited by G. N. Boardman, 185-221; early history, 185; education, 187; student in Germany, 189; appointment to the Hebrew chair in Andover, 191; tribute by Dr. Denio, 192; connection with the Old South controversy, 195; literary work, 196; second visit to Europe, 197; love of nature, 197; service as Professor of Dogmatics in Hartford Theological Seminary, 199; service upon the Bible Revision, 201; last visit to Europe, 206; tribute to his memory, 207; characteristics as a man and thinker, 210; theological position, 213; breadth of his attainments, 215; interest in political affairs, 218; list of publications, 219.
- Merrins, E. M., articles by, 115-135, 438-463, 565-590.
- Ministry of Pain, articles on, by E. M. Merrins, 115-135, 438-463, 565-590; continued prevalence of pain, 115; increased

sensitivity of civilized races, 116; ideas of savage races, 118; the Egyptian view of pain, 119; the Babylonian, 119; the Zoroastrian, 120; the Epicurean view, 120; the Stoic, 121; the Chinese, 122; the Hindu, 123; the Moham-medan, 124; the Christian, 124; pain the price paid for fullness and security of physical life, 126; guards the body from injury, 128; enforces rest, 130; the dark side of the subject, 131; little pain among the lower animals, 133; death ordinarily painless, 134; pain and the development of mind, 438; importance of growing ability to profit by painful experience, 440; promotes tribal and national organization, 441; physical and mental distress indispensable to progress, 442; pain and moral development, 444; development of moral qualities through war, 445; province of moral bravery, 446; nourishment of manly virtues, 447; heroism of motherhood, 448; attainment of lofty moral heights, 449; pain and the development of the spiritual nature, 450; self-realization, 451; the lowly beginnings of spiritual life, 452; belief in ghosts or spirits, 453; spiritual heights of disinterested love, 455; austerities still have their place, 457; asceticism not successful in missionary work, 457; ministry of Christ's suffering, 458; relation of sin to suffering, 459; suffering not good in itself, 460; the use of anæsthetics, 461; spiritual power comes through pain, 462; Paul's thorn in the flesh, 462; primitive animism, 566; Nature not man's antagonist, 567; her laws to be obeyed, 568; heroic endurance of pain,

569; man ceases to fear Nature, 570; mission of war in the past, 572; purified by adversity, 573; insensibility of martyrs to pain, 574; pain viewed as a visitation of God, 575; heroism evoked by epidemics, 576; victory over suffering, 577; benefit of anæsthetics, 578; Jesus an example of vicarious suffering, 579; pain never spiritually fruitless, 580; pain educational rather than punitive, 582; duty of submission, 583; folly of passive rebellion, 584; significance of a suffering Christ, 585; evil not eternal but transitory, 586; material prosperity not the measure of a nation's spiritual greatness, 588; the nobility of our spiritual calling and election, 590. Möller's, W., *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung*, noticed, 163-165. Mosher's, W. E., *Promise of the Christ-Age in Recent Literature*, noticed, 720. Munro's, J. I., *Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism*, noticed, 360.

N

Negeb in Exodus, note on, 345-348. Neighbor, R. E., article by, 22-34. Newman, John Henry, article on, by G. N. Boardman, 618-641; political and theological conditions of his times, 618; his personality, 619; history, 620; intellectual characteristics, 621; personal characteristics, 623; a restorer of ideals, 623; as a preacher, 626; as a Tractarian, 628; Tract No. 90, 629; as a student of church history, 631; mental perplexity, 632; autobiography, 633; argumentative self-justification, 634; labors and experiences in the

Catholic Church, 637; present estimate of the Oxford Movement, 639.

Nietzsche Madness, article on, by C. H. Lerch, 71-87; key to his teaching, 71; his spirit of egotism, 73; how translate his mind, 76; his body a physical wreckage, 77; his spirit the opposite of Christianity, 79; inconsistencies, 81; antagonism to Christianity, 85.

Notices of Recent Publications, 159-184, 358-376, 527-546, 707-722.

O

Old Testament Critics, The Philosophy and Theology of Leading, article on, by A. C. Knudson, 1-21; eight names of preëminent significance, 1; Spinoza, 4; Richard Simon, 5; Eichhorn, 6; De Wette, 7; Ewald, 8; Vatke, 9; Kuenen, 10; Wellhausen, 11; influence of unchristian philosophy, 14; influence of apriorism, 16; the rejection of miracles, 18; unwarranted dogmatism of the critics, 21.

Old Testament, Organic Unity of the, articles on, by A. Troelstra, 377-408; inevitable search for unity, 377; misdirected efforts, 378; analogy as a guide, 379; correlation and criticism as guides, 380; miracles not to be excluded, 381; influence of presuppositions, 382; biblical criticism not purely literary, 383; origin of higher criticism, 384; influence of Astruc, 385; irrelevant facts, 387; use of the Divine names, 388; origin of the Pentateuch, 389; the two problems, 390; evolutionary presuppositions, 391; reality of the Word of God, 392; the witness of the Spirit, 393; the uniqueness of the Bible, 394; the authority of the New

Testament, 395; the Proto-evangelium, 396; the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, 397; errors of higher criticism, 398; answers to the higher critics, 399; importance of a correct viewpoint, 402; Christ the center of sacred history, 404; prophecy and miracle, inseparable elements of the system, 405; notes, 406.

P

Pain, The Ministry of, articles on, by E. M. Merrins, 115-135, 438-463, 565-590.

Passion Week, Problems of the, article on, by A. M. Haggard, 664-692; difficulties of the problems, 664; the day of crucifixion, not Friday but Thursday, 665; the Passover anticipated, 667; prevalent errors, 669; agreement of Catholic and Protestant scholars, 669; crucifixion not on Wednesday, 672; arguments for Friday, 673; day of unleavened bread, 674; argument from Matt. xxviii. 1, 676; false assumptions, 678; argument upon the great assumption, 680; argument for fifty-nine or sixty hours, 682; astronomical argument, 683; conclusion, 688; notes, 689.

Paul's Transformation in Character, note on, 522-526.

Pentateuch, New Methods of Inquiry concerning the, article on, by J. Dahse, 657-663; prevalence of the Wellhausen theories, 657; their rejection by recent scholars, 658; material for textual criticism of the Old Testament, 659; illustrations of corrupt text, 660; explanation of some repetitions, 661; the Priestly Code, not all post-exilic, 662.

Pentateuchal Criticism, Some Aspects of the Conservative Task in, article on, by H. M. Wiener, 310-328; recent ad-

ditions to the conservative critics, 310; inconsistencies of Dr. Briggs, 313; neglect of his early postulates, 315; honorable position of Professor Toy, 318; of H. P. Smith, 319; Dr. Driver's inconsistencies, 320; Dr. A. R. Gordon's dilemma, 323; Dr. Skinner's tergiversations, 324; his offense a continuing one, 327. Petrie's Excavations at Heliopolis, article on, by M. G. Kyle, 553-564. Philosophy, The Bearing of One's, on Creed, article on, by R. E. Neighbor, 22-34. Pope's, II., Date of the Composition of Deuteronomy, noticed, 166. Preaching to the Spirits in Prison, note on, by A. E. Thomson, 142-151. Priddy's, A., Through the Mill, noticed, 183. Prime, R. E., note by, 136-141.

R

Reddin, L., article by, 693-706. Regeneration, Social or Individual, article on, by A. v. C. P. Huizinga, 35-54. Religion of Israel and Its Newer Representation, History of the, article on, by E. König, 513-521; influence of Vatke, 513; of Hegel's evolutionary theory, 514; continued influence of this theory, 515; unscientific treatment of Israel's history, 516; writings opposed to Wellhausenism, 516; Wellhausen's theory utterly disproved, 517; high character of the patriarchal religion, 518; the name of God not borrowed from the Midianites, 519; the existence of critics outside of the Wellhausen school, 520; attempts of the Wellhausen school to ignore orthodox critics futile, 520; unprejudiced use of the sources imperative, 521.

Richardson's E. C., Periodical Articles on Religion, 1890-1899, noticed, 544.

Robinson's, A. C., What About the Old Testament, noticed, 365.

Romanism, The Question of a Reform of, article on, by H. C. Sheldon, 591-617: optimistic views, 591; increase of sentimental devotion, 593; increased adoration of Mary, 593; pilgrimages to shrines, 594; teaching concerning the sacraments, 595; renewed emphasis on baptism, 596; state of unbaptized infants, 597; transubstantiation, 598; the sacrament of penance, 599; office of the priest in the forgiveness of sins, 600; increased efficacy of ecclesiastical mechanism, 601; infallibility of the pope, 602; autocratic régime, 604; undiminished intolerance, 606; decisions of the Biblical Commission, 607; denunciation of the Reformers, 608; papal absolutism, 609; attempts to control the State, 610; weakness of the Modernist movement, 615; tragedy of the present situation, 616.

Ruth, The Purpose of the Book of, article on, by L. B. Wolfenson, 329-344; time of its composition, 329; early date of, 330; not a fiction, 331; views of Bertholdt and Benary, 332; of Reuss, 333; of Köhler, 334; of Wellhausen, 335; not a polemic against the reforms of Ezra, 336; the *Tendenz* hypothesis untenable, 338; a real historical episode, 341; notes, 342.

S

Sadducean Christians of Damascus, The, article on, by G. Margollouth, 421-437; criticism of Dr. Ward on the Zadokite Document, 421; did the

- document emanate from the Zadokites, 422; Dr. Schechter's view, 423; mention of Zadok not incidental, 424; real strength of Dr. Schechter's argument, 426; the question of date, 427; probably later than 70 A.D., 428; settlement of early Christians in Damascus, 429; Messianic views of the period, 430; absence of reference to the Temple and to the Lord's Day, 432; other negative arguments, 433; identification of the Anointed One, 435.
- Schmidt's, A., Gedanken über die Entwicklung der Religion, auf Grund der babylonischen Quellen, noticed, 530.
- Scriptural Foundation for Christian Unity, article on, by B. T. Stafford, 55-70.
- Sheldon, H. C., article by, 591-617.
- Shook's, C. A., Cumorah Revisited, noticed, 721.
- Simpson's, W. J. S., Resurrection and Modern Thought, noticed, 170-172.
- Smith's, J. M. P., Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, and Nahum, noticed, 464.
- Social or Individual Regeneration, article on, by A. v. C. P. Huizinga, 35-54; socialistic tendencies, 35; the social gospel of to-day, 36; conditions of life not omnipotent, 37; protest against socialism, 38; man not the slave of circumstances, 39; moral integrity still exists, 40; views of Maurice, 41; of Baldwin and Ormond, 42; Spencer's definition, 43; zeal without knowledge, 44; mercenary officials, 45; civilization cannot be forced, 48; formation of character the church's chief function, 49; futility of political machinery, 50; impotency of negative methods, 53; the individual the starting-point, 54.
- Spencer's, F. E., Short Introduction to the Old Testament, noticed, 540-542.
- Spirits in Prison, Preaching to the, note on, 142-151.
- Stafford, B. T., article by, 55-70.
- Stonewall Regiment, Charge of the, poem on, by G. Campbell, 549.
- Strong's, A. H., Miscellanies, noticed, 535.
- T
- Taylor's, D., Composition of Matter and the Evolution of Mind, noticed, 545.
- Testimony of Josephus concerning Jesus, article on, by H. M. Magoun, 288-309.
- Theology, The Philosophy and, of Leading Old Testament Critics, article on, by A. C. Knudson, 1-21.
- Thomas, W. H. G., article by, 409-420; book reviews by, 167-172, 173-176, 178, 360-365, 367, 368.
- Thomas's, W. H. G., Work of the Ministry, noticed, 370.
- Thomson, A. E., note by, 142-151.
- Tisdall's W. S., Why I am Not a Higher Critic, noticed, 182.
- Troelstra, A., article by, 377-408.
- Troelstra's, A., De Naam Gods in den Pentateuch, noticed, 538-540.
- U
- Unity of the Old Testament, Organic, article on, by A. Troelstra, 377-408.
- Unity, The Scriptural Foundation for Christian, article on, by B. T. Stafford, 55-70.
- V
- Vries, J. H. de, translation by, 377-408.
- W
- Wallis's, L., Sociological Study of the Bible, noticed, 542.

- Ward's, W. H., Commentary on Habakkuk, noticed, 464.
- Welch's, A. C., Religion of Israel under the Kingdom, noticed, 716.
- Whitelaw's, T., Old Lamp, noticed, 536.
- Wiener, H. M., articles by, 310-328, 464-491, 642-656; book reviews by, 163-165, 538-542, 711-716; notes by, 151-158, 345-348; correspondence with Dr. Gordon, 349-357.
- Wiener's, H. M., Pentateuchal Studies, noticed, 710.
- Williams's, E. F., Life of Dr. D. K. Pearsons, noticed, 372.
- Wolfenson, L. B., article by, 329-344.
- Wright, F. B., book review by, 373-376.
- Z
- Zerbe's, A. S., Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature, noticed, 366.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION
AND COURSES IN BIBLE READING.¹

H. W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

REV. J. L. CAMPBELL, D.D.

REV. RICHARD WRIGHT.

REALIZING from personal experience that there are many men both within and without the church who are puzzled and perplexed not only concerning things taught in the Bible but also concerning the book itself, the Committee on Instruction and Courses in Bible Reading for Greater Boston undertook to prepare a brief topical index to articles bearing on such matters in a few standard works that are easily accessible. Evidence from the monuments, the researches of scientific men, and a sound textual criticism are all doing much to settle disputed points and to restore confidence in the accuracy, reliability, and authority of the Scriptures. It should be possible to find these things easily and quickly. Misunderstood and misinterpreted passages can also be clarified, and this should be done. Help is here provided to that end.

¹ This report was prepared for the Men and Religion Forward Movement in the city of Boston. A member of the Bibliotheca Sacra staff, chancing to come from Oberlin to Cambridge, saw my copy and asked that it be shown to the editor. The latter, on seeing it, desired it for his quarterly, and it was gladly furnished. The Bibliotheca Sacra Co. make a specialty of such material, and three new important volumes will have been issued by them, by the time this article goes to press. They are:—"Origin and Antiquity of Man," by G. Frederick Wright (\$2.17 postpaid); "Pentateuchal Studies," by Harold M. Wiener (\$2.17 postpaid); and "The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism," by Melvin G. Kyle (\$1.65 postpaid). Much desirable information has been embodied in these books, and they can be consulted with profit. The references to BS have been brought up to date in the index appended to the report.—H. M. W.

To economize space, the following abbreviations are used:—

A=Clay's Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites.
Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia, Pa.. \$1.38
postpaid. A scholar's conclusions.

BG=Urquhart's New Biblical Guide. Gospel Publishing
House, Bible School Park, Lestershire, N. Y. 8 vol.
\$7.00, *net*. A remarkable work.

BS=Bibliotheca Sacra. The oldest theological quarterly in
America. In most libraries. Contains popular as well
as technical articles.

EB=Encyclopædia Britannica. 9th and 11th editions. Ref-
erences to the latter are in parentheses.

LOT=Clay's Light on the Old Testament from Babel. Sun-
day School Times Co., Philadelphia, Pa. \$2.20 post-
paid. A most valuable help to Bible study.

OP=Wiener's Origin of the Pentateuch. Bibliotheca Sacra
Co., Oberlin, O. 40c. postpaid. A masterly defense
of the Mosaic authorship. Unanswered.

SBE=Sacred Books of the East. In most libraries. What
other religions have to offer. Christian ideas should
not be read into heathen expressions.

SC=Wright's Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament
History. Bibliotheca Sacra Co., Oberlin, O. \$2.17
postpaid. Already in Dutch, German, and Swedish.

*N. B. References are to volumes and first pages. Authors
are at the end in parentheses where necessary. Simple words
are substituted for less common ones. Abbreviations, authors,
subjects, and volume numbers all hold until a change occurs.
Observe headings and punctuation marks, and a little study
will solve the puzzles. Everything had to be subordinated to
brevity to cover so much ground in such a small space.*

TOPICS.

- Aaron's Rod: BG, lii. 226.
 Abraham and his Times: BG, ii. 64; LOT, 145.
 Ahasuerus: BG, vi. 311.
 Amos: BS, lix. 192, 366 (Braithwaite); lxviii. 308 (Stibitz).
 Antediluvians, The: BG, i. 245.
 Antediluvian Patriarchs: A, 63.
 Antiquity of Man: LOT, 1. See Man.
 Archæology: BS, liv. 389 (Berle); and Scriptures, lxvii. 373 (Kyle); BG, lii. 196; v. 1, 311.
 Ark among Philistines: BG, v. 153. See Bubonic Plague.
 Ascent of Man, Drummond's: BS, lii. 351 (Kelsey).
 Assyrians, The: BG, v. 350; and Israel, vi. 10, 20, 37.
 Atonement: BS, lvi. 689 (Thomson); lxvi. 458 (Barnes).
 Authority: BS, lxvii. 565 (Hulzinga); of Scriptures, lv. 414 (Estes).
 Azariah: BG, vi. 235.
 Babel-Bible Controversy: BS, lxviii. 641 (Notz).
 Babylonian Palæography: BS, liv. 391 (Berle).
 Babylon in Ezra's Time: LOT, 390.
 Balaam: BS, liiii. 150 (Whitney); BG, iv. 281.
 Bible: Influence on Intellect, BS, lvi. 415; on Conscience, lvii. 336 (Rankin); and Scholarship, 366 (Stimson); Criticism, lxi. 409, 666 (Kuyper); in Common English, lxii. 766 (Blaisdell); and Science, lxiv. 299 (Hitchcock); and Modern Discoveries, BG, i. 93, 139; Languages of, vii. 305; Canon of O. T., viii. 83; Authority of, 304, 328.
 Body, Physical and Spiritual: BS, ix. 487 (Boardman); lxi. 563 (Goddard).
 Book of Jasher, etc.: Lost Books, BG, viii. 420.
 Book, Land, and People: Bible, BS, lviii. 103 (Curtiss).
 Book vs. Sources: BS, lvi. 209 (Beecher).
 Bubonic Plague in Bible: BS, lxi. 292 (Merrins).
 Buddhism: EB (iv. 742); Pall Literature of, v. 366 (iv. 745); xviii. 184 (xx. 630); Canonical Books of, SBE, x.; Do. of North. Buddhists, xxi.; Moral Code of, xlii., xvii., xx., Religious Discourses of, xi.; Life of Buddha, xix.; in Japan; BS, lixi, 100 (Bartlett).
 Calvinism: BS, liii. 401 (Lanphear); lxvi. 671 (Calkins); and Darwinism, 685 (Wright).
 Canaanites: Conquest of, east side, BG, iv. 245; west, 349; Destruction of, 402; viii. 442; Land of, iv. 412.
 Captivity: of Israel, BG, vi. 45, 65, 73; of Judah, 210.
 Catholicism: and Americanism, BS, lixi. 269 (Bierbower); Reformation of, 591 (Sheldon).
 Causes and Reasons: BS, lixi. 125 (Bascom).
 Chedorlaomer: BG, ii. 170; LOT, 125.
 Chinese Scriptures: EB, v. 659 (vi. 222); Book of Odes or Yi King, SBE, xvi.; Book of Traditions or Shû King, lii.; Ceremonial or Li Ki, xxvii., xxviii.
 Christ: and Civilization, BS, lvi. 327 (Hillis); Bloody sweat of, liv. 469 (Keen); Divinity of, lix. 267 (Wright); Death of, lxii. 38, 229 (Merrins); 514 (Howland); Dual Nature of, lii. 531; liii. 250, 444 (Foster); lxii. 640 (Burton); Example of, lviii. 383 (McLaughlin); at Gethsemane, lxvii. 598 (Thomson); Incarnation of, liv. 729 (Wendel); lxiv. 331 (Crannell); Position of, ix. 454 (Shaw); lxvii. 433 (Boardman); lxviii. 34 (Dunkmann); Resurrection

- of, III. 708 (Hutchings); Ivl. 696 (Weston), Second Coming of, Iviii. 705 (Fairfield); Ixiv. 51 (Metcalf); Ixviii. 600 (Parker); Teachings of, Ili. 271 (Sewall); Iv. 717 (Berry); Ixi. 1 (Thwing); "Son of man," Ivl. 680 (Evans); in the Four Gospels, Ixix. 222 (Gardner); Testimony of Josephus concerning, Ixix. 288 (Magoun); the Rabbi, 693 (Reddin).
- Christian Charity: BS, Iix. 501 (Perry).
- Christian Love: BS, Ixiv. 265, 419 (Magoun); Ixvi. 526 (Howland).
- Christology in 19th Cent.: BS, Ixviii. 381 (Bavinck).
- Chronicles, Books of: BG, vi. 227, 235.
- Conscience: BS, Iviii. 556 (Caverno).
- Corinthians, 1st: Study of, BS, Ivl. 760 (Lawrence).
- Creation: Hebrew Cosmogony, BS, Ilii. 50, 522; Ivi. 165; Iviii. 778 (Warring); and Geology, Ixv. 169; Ixvi. 453 (Magoun); of Eve, Ix. 121 (Howland); the Transmutation of Energy, Iv. 213 (Cooper); Genesis and Science, SC, 368; Babylonian Story of, BG, i. 151; LOT, 59; Story, A, 44; BG, i. 139.
- Criticism, Reasonable: Beecher on, BS, Ixix. 409 (Thomas).
- Damascus: BG, v. 340; and Jeroboam II., 346; Fall of, vi. 56; and Inscriptions, 61.
- Daniel, Book of, BG, vii. 157, 239; viii. 46; Captivity of, vii. 174, 184; Name of, 194; and the Chaldeans, 203; and Nebuchadnezzar's Dream, 225.
- David: Famine of, BG, v. 181; Empire of, 191; and Law, 199.
- Deluge: Prestwich on, BS, Ili. 724; Confirmation of, Iix. 282, 537, 695 (Wright); Place of, 579 (Adams); Noah on, Ixlii. 510 (Bishop); and Science, Ixiv. 519 (Whitley); and Ice Age, Ixvi. 217, 431; Ixvii. 105, 204 (Magoun); Traditions of, Ixiv. 148 (Restelle); BG, i. 256; Date of, 298; BS, Ixvii. 204; Geology and, BG, i. 309, 343, 358; Traditions, Causes, and Evidences of, SC, 159; Babylonian Story of, LOT, 77; Story, A, 71.
- Demoniacal Possession. BS, Ixlii. 300, 460 (Merrins).
- Deuteronomy: BS, Ili. 741 (Wright); Ilii. 681 (Watson); McNele on, Ixix. 642 (Wiener).
- Discrepancies: BS, Ixiv. 767 (Wright).
- Diseases of Antiochus, Herod, etc.: BS, Ixi. 548 (Merrins).
- Divine Existence, Proofs of: BS, Iv. 459 (Walker).
- Divine Goodness, in Severity: BS, Iv. 485 (Tenney).
- Driver's Proof Texts: BS, Iv. 515; Ivi. 140 (Wright).
- Elijah: BG, v. 385.
- Elisba: BG, v. 411.
- Esther: Book of, BG, vi. 303; and History, 325, 336, 344, 360, 369. See Mordecai.
- Evidence. See Veracity.
- Evil, Mystery of: BS, Ivl. 379 (Chalmers); Ix. 401, 649 (Cooper).
- Evolution: BS, Ivl. 303; and Immanence, Ili. 559 (Wright); and Fall of Man, Iiv. 1 (Simon); and Christianity, 542 (Mackenzie); Ixli. 264 (Thurston); and Calvinism, 560 (Reeve); and Freedom, 565 (Hawkins); and Miracle, Ixv. 572 (Campbell).
- Exodus: The, BG, Ili. 292, 363; Iv. 1, 126; Driver on, Book of, BS, Ixix. 151 (Wiener).
- Ezekiel, Prophecy of, BG, vii. 102.
- Ezra, Book of: BG, vi. 279.
- Faith and the Trial of Jesus: BS, Ivi. 223 (Lamb).
- False Biology and Fatalism: BS, Ixv. 358 (Gullick).

Famine in Egypt: BS, lix. 169 (Wright).
 Freedom: BS, lviii. 209 (Foster); lxiii. 164 (Wright); of Will, 35, 732 (Potwin); 729 (Howland).
 Garden of Eden: BG, i. 177, 197.
 Genesis xiv., History: LOT, 125.
 Gentiles: BG, viii. 245.
 Geological Time: BS, ix. 578 (Wright).
 Gilgal Covenant: BG, iv. 339.
 God: Wisdom of, BS, ix. 718. (Hulbert); Belief in, lxvi. 606 (Whitley); Fatherhood of, lxii. 666 (Ross).
 Golden Calf: BG, iv. 56, 68.
 Gospels: Date of, BS, lxx. 657 (Flournoy); Beginning of, lix. 744 (Bradshaw).
 Gullck, John: and Romanes, BS, liii. 165; Investigations of, lvii. 608.
 Healing: Gift of, BS, lxvi. 385 (Merrins); in N. T., lxviii. 233 (Fox).
 Hebrew writing, Age of: BG, iv. 43; viii. 368.
 Heliopolis: Excavations at, BS, lxx. 553 (Kyle).
 Heredity: BS, lxviii. 191 (Merrins).
 Hezekiah: Labors of, BG, vi. 242; and Sennacherib, 122, 166; Boil of, BS, lxi. 300.
 Higher Criticism: Canons of and Burns' Ode, BS, iv. 557 (Hayman); and English, iv. 738 (Wright); and Age of Isaac, lxviii. 705 (Wiener); Present Day, lxi. 409 (Kuyper); and Science, lxx. 57 (Lamb); and Messianic Prophecy, lix. 305 (Dewart); Origin of, BG, i. 1; Object of, 27; Difficulties of, 67; and Patriarchs, ii. 44, 270; and Lower Criticism, viii. 13; and Modern Experience, i. 75; Moderate, BS, lxx. 88 (Griffiths) International Critical Commentary. 464 (Wiener).

Hinduism and Christianity: BS, lv. 591 (Jones).
 Hindu Scriptures: Brahmanism, EB, iv. 201 (381); Sanscrit Literature, xxi. 273 (xxiv. 159); Vedanta, xxiv. 117, (xxiv. 177); Bhagavadgita, or Song-of-the-Blessed-One, SBE, viii.; Domestic Ceremonies, xxix., xxx.; Institutes of Vishnu, vii.; Law of Manu, xxv.; Minor Law Books, xxxiii.; Sacrificial Ceremonies, xii., xxvi.; Sacred Laws, ii., xiv.; Upanishads, or Vedic Philosophy, i. xv.; Vedanta-Sûtras, or Rules of Supreme Knowledge, xxxiv.; Vedic Hymns, xxxii. See Jains.
 Hittites: BG, v. 331.
 Holy Spirit: BS, lvi. 78 (Hulbert); lxiii. 427 (Thomson); lxvi. 243 (Davis).
 Homer: Knoetel's, BS, lix. 688 (Bartlett); and Critics, lxx. 531 (Everts).
 Huxley and Phillips Brooks: BS, lix. 1 (Clarke).
 Immanence, Perils of Present Views: BS, lxx. 87 (Rollins).
 Industrial Problem: and Christianity; BS, lxx. 492 (Bonner).
 Inerrancy of Scriptures: BG, viii. 328, 347, 354.
 Inspiration: BG, viii. 173, 289, 328, 347, 396, 399; BS, iii. 1 (Wright); 69, 232 (Foster); iii. 205, 429 (Monroe); lvi. 160 (Bartlett); Verbal, lxiv. 109 (Jarrel); 173 (Wright).
 Isaiah: BS, iii. 347 (Caverno); lviii. 68 (Osgood); BG, vi. 424; vii. 1.
 Israel: in Canaan, Date of, BS, lxi. 496 (Houghton); Laws of, lxx. 97 (Wiener); in Egypt, liii. 745 (Berle); BG, iii. 1, 162; and Palestine, v. 35; No. Kingdom of, 367; and Prophecy, viii. 272.
 Jains, The: EB, xlii. 543 (xv. 127); Gaina-Sûtras, or Religious Rules of, SBE, xxii.

- Jehu's Dynasty: BG, vi. 20.
 Jephthah's Vow: BG, v. 93.
 Jeremiah: BG, vii. 71, 95.
 Jericho, Fall of: BG, iv. 349; SC, 126.
 Jeroboam: BG, v. 305.
 Jesus. See Christ.
 John's Gospel: Critics of, BS, liii. 1 (Ferguson); Date of, ix. 244 (Rishell); Theology of, lxviii. 285 (Lias).
 Jonah: BG, v. 347; Book of, vii. 117.
 Jordan, Crossing of: BG, iv. 324; SC, 130.
 Joseph: BG, ii. 283, 426; iii. 1; Pharaoh of, ii. 359.
 Joshua: Book of, BG, iv. 319; and Gibeon, 387; and Sun and Moon, 397.
 Judges, Period of, BS, liv. 387 (Berle); BG, v. 8, 48, 107.
 Judgment Day: BS, ix. 379 (Fairfield).
 Justification by Faith: BS, lxxv. 755 (Curtis).
 Kingdom of God: BS, liv. 525 (Chapman); lvi. 26 (Noble).
 Kings, Book of: BG, v. 217; Chronology of, vi. 1.
 Lord's Prayer, The: BS, lxiii. 635 (Richards).
 Magicians: Egyptian, BG, iii. 216; Babylonian, vii. 214.
 Man: in Ice Age, BS, lix. 730 (Upham); ix. 28 (Wright); 572 (Miss Owen); Origin of, ix. 261 (Macloskie); Unity of, BG, i. 381.
 Manasseh: BG, vi. 199, 258.
 Melchizedek: BG, ii. 205.
 Mind and Matter: BS, lviii. 1 (Cooper).
 Miracle: Nature of, BS, iv. 360 (Wright); Place of, lvi. 12 (Blake); lxvii. 637 (Barnes); Motive for, lvii. 154 (Chase); and Law, etc., ix. 750 (Warring); and Nature, lxiii. 542 (Greene); and Religion, lxviii. 557; Testimony for, lxii. 126 (Lamb).
 Missions and Science, etc.: BS, lvii. 193 (Ewing).
 Moabite Stone: BG, v. 317.
 Mohammedan Scriptures or Koran: SBE, vi., ix., EB, xvi. 597 (xv. 898); Theism of, xxiii. 242.
 Monotheism: a Primal Revelation, BG, ii. 48; Hebrew, BS, lxiv. 609 (Wiener).
 Monuments: Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, BG, ii. 210; iii. 363; iv. 251; v. 25; viii. 376; BS, liv. 334, 413 (Metcalf); LOT, 251; Temple Records, 283; Historical Inscriptions, 313, 361; A. 95, 150. See Shushan.
 Mordcai: BG, vi. 389, 397.
 Mosaic Authorship: Argument from Law, etc., OP. 58; Literary Argument, 81; Higher Critical Positions, 92, 107; the Issues, 110; Hexateuch Theory, 112; Constructive Case, 113; Evidence for Mosaic Date, 117; for Pre-Mosaic Date, 134; Evidence of Tradition, 141; Conclusions, 143.
 Mosaic Law: Ethics of, BS, lxvi. 267 (Smith); and Hammurabi's Code, LOT, 201, 223.
 Moses: Mission of, BG, iii. 180; and Pharaoh, 195; Death of, iv. 307.
 Nahum: BG, vii. 147.
 Nebuchadnezzar: Abasement of, BS, lxii. 601 (Merrins); Dream of, BG, vii. 225.
 New Birth: BS, lxvi. 278 (Davis).
 New Evangelism: BS, lxii. 354 (Richards); lxiv. 726 (Hayes).
 New Theology: BS, liv. 96 (Biddle); lviii. 632 (Dewart); lxi. 529, 731 (Churchman).
 New Testament: and other Religions, BS, lxxv. 1 (Baljon); Formation of, lxvi. 512, 594 (Flournoy); and Christianity, BG, vii. 255; and Heathen Testimony, 266; Date of, 280; Language of, 294; Authors of, 313, 328; Gospels of, 348.
 Nimrod and his Times: BG, i. 426.

- Old Testament: Unity of, BS, lxi. 377 (Troelstra).
- Ophir: BG, v. 258.
- Pain: Ministry of, BS, lxi. 115, 438, 565 (Merrins).
- Palestine: BS, lviii. 360, 740 (Wright); SC, 118; of Abraham, BG, ii. 262.
- Papyri, Elephantine: BS, lxxviii. 94 (Everts).
- Passion Week, Problems of, BS, lxi. 664 (Haggard).
- Paul: Gospel of, BS, liii. 89 (Foster); Life of, iv. 244 (Gilbert); Theology of, lvi. 278 (Bosworth); lx. 61 (Marsh); Thorn of, lxiv. 661 (Merrins); Witness of, lvi. 657 (Williams); lviii. 270 (Lloyd); Conversion of, BG, vii. 350; Transformation of, BS, lxi. 522 (Haydn).
- Pentateuch: Difficulty in, BS, liii. 645 (Hayman); Essays on Criticism of, lxxv. 481, 723; lxxvi. 119, 291, 411; lxxviii. 1; lxi. 310, 345 (Wiener); Future Life in, lii. 423 (Potwin); Outline of, lxxvii. 625 (Smith); Rupperecht on, lvi. 639 (Bartlett); Samaritan, lx. 601 (Barton); and Writing, BG, iv. 45; and Altar of Incense, viii. 55; Text of, BS, lxi. 657 (Dahse).
- Persian Scriptures: EB, xviii. 134 (xx. 454); Late Theological Works, SBE, v., xviii., xxiv. See Zend-Avesta.
- Pharaoh: of Exodus, BS, liii. 747 (Berle); BG, iii. 146; of Oppression, 129.
- Philistines and the Ark: BS, lxi. 292 (Merrins).
- Philosophy: and Religion, BS, lix. 637; of Religion, lxxiii. 653; lxxvi. 38; and Socialism, lxxvii. 86 (Lindsay); and Christ, 284 (Campbell); and Creed, lxi. 22 (Neighbor).
- Plagues, Egyptian: BS, lxxv. 401, 611 (Merrins); BG, iii. 232.
- Prayer: in War, BS, lvi. 532 (Chapman); Reasonableness of, lxxvi. 531 (Russell).
- Priests: Code of, BS, lxxvii. 20 (Lias); Dues of, lii. 18 (Hayman).
- Prophecy: BS, lix. 50 (Betteridge); BG, viii. 204; Messianic, 232.
- Prophets, Hebrew: Authority of, BS, lxxii. 105, 287 (Denio).
- Punishment, Purpose of: BS, lix. 768 (Wright).
- Red Sea, Crossing of: BS, lviii. 570 (Wright); SC, 87.
- Rehoboam: BG, v. 288.
- Religion: Personal, BS, lvii. 553 (King); Impulses of, lviii. 751 (Leuba); and Science, lix. 557 (Sardeson); Comparative, lix. 764 (Smith); History of Israel's, lxi. 513 (König); Aryan, EB, xx. 360; of Egypt and that of Israel, BG, iv. 87.
- Religious Life: BS, lix. 21 (Fairchild).
- Righteousness, Personal: BS, lvii. 54 (Moxom).
- Resurrection: in O. T., BS, lix. 409 (Osgood); Paul on, lxxvii. 391 (Mead).
- Ruth, Purpose of Book of: BS, lxi. 329 (Wolfenson).
- Sabbath, The: A, 55.
- Sacrifice, Semitic: BS, lii. 342 (Berle).
- Samaritans, The: BG, vi. 100; and Jews, 288.
- Sampson: BG, v. 110.
- Samuel, Books of: BG, v. 139.
- Saul, Reign of: BG, v. 169.
- Scientific Authority: BS, lxxiii. 57 (Springer).
- Scientific Study of O. T.: BS, lxxviii. 249 (Wiener).
- Scriptures, Interpretation of: BS, lx. 334 (Davis).
- Secularism, Can it do It? BS, lxxv. 331 (Harrison).
- Semitic Culture, Original Home of: A, 83.
- Sennacherib's Army: BS, lxi. 298 (Merrins); BG, vi. 172; Date of, 190.
- Sermon on the Mount: BS, lix. 381 (Wright).
- Serpent in the Wilderness: BG, iv. 224.

- Severity. See Divine Goodness.
- Shushan, Excavations at: BG, vi. 344, 351.
- Sin: Dante's Vision of, BS, lviii. 378 (Dinsmore); Forgiveness of, lx. 158; First and its Consequences, 315 (Walker).
- Sociology: Dynamic Principles of, BS, lvii. 386; Christian Factor in, 766 (Wright); Formative Principles of, lx. 358 (Stafford); in Matt. and Luke, lxvi. 193 (Knight).
- Sodom and Gomorrah: BG, ii. 220; SC, 144.
- Solomon: Myths concerning, BG, v. 217; Reign of, 227.
- Song of Solomon: BS, lv. 53 (Curtiss).
- Supernatural, The: BS, liv. 568 (Morton); lix. 238 (Bascom); and Nature, lxviii. 584 (Gardner).
- Tabernacle at Shiloh: BG, v. 146.
- Tadmor: BG, v. 267.
- Temple: Builders of Second, BS, liii. 231 (Betteridge); in Egypt, lxv. 170 (Wright).
- Textual Criticism: of O. T., BS, lxvii. 59, 274, 346; lxviii. 154, 156, 491 (Wiener); vs. Higher Criticism, OP, 18.
- Theology: Reconstruction of, BS, liv. 108 (Beach); and Piety, lvii. 1 (Scott); of O. T., 512 (Burroughs); in Terms of Personal Relation, 723 (King); and Theism, lviii. 419 (Lindsay); Christocentric, lxii. 440 (Buckham); of O. T. Critics, lxix. 1 (Knudson).
- Thief on the Cross: BS, liii. 100 (Barton); 574 (Lawrence).
- Tiglath-Pileser: BG, vi. 37.
- Tower of Babel: LOT, 89.
- Trinity: BS, lix. 58 (Howland); 85 (Brown); lxii. 455 (Walker); Man a, lviii. 692 (Howland).
- Ur of the Chaldees: A, 167.
- Veracity, Law of: BS, lxi. 366 (Campbell).
- Wellhausen: School of, BS, lxiv. 1; Prolegomena of, lxvi. 692; lxvii. 486, 654; lxviii. 159, 658 (Wiener).
- Witchcraft and O. T.: BS, lix. 26 (Smith).
- Words, Pagan and Christian, Meaning of: BS, lxvii. 459 (Stafford).
- Zadokite Document: BS, lxix. 421 (Margollouth).
- Zechariah, Book of: BS, liv. 634 (Betteridge).
- Zend-Avesta: EB, xxiv. 775 (xxviii. 967); Vendidad or Priestly Code, SBE, iv.; Hymns, Prayers, etc., xxiii.; Liturgy, xxxi.

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism

BY

Melvin Grove Kyle, D.D., LL.D.

Lecturer on Biblical Archaeology in Xenia Theological Seminary, Archaeological Editor of the Sunday School Times, etc.

325 pages, 8vo, cloth. \$1.50, net; postage, 15 cents.

This volume is the most thorough discussion of the Value of Archaeological Evidence in Criticism of the Bible yet to appear. It is the result of profound study by one for many years engaged in actual research work in Bible lands.

The volume is prefaced by an introduction by Professor James Orr, D.D. The work of the author is divided into three parts. Part I. describes the function of archaeology in criticism, showing, in four chapters, that only archaeology is bringing forth new facts on the questions raised by criticism. Part II., in ten chapters, gives the history of the testing of critical theories by archaeological facts. The treatment of this portion of the subject, though concise, is well-nigh exhaustive. Part III., in seven chapters, presents the progress of archaeological research in testing the Biblical narrative and in settling questions raised by criticism.

"I have read Dr. Kyle's 'Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism' with considerable care. . . . I do not know of any book that pretends to fill the place which this will occupy. . . . I most heartily commend it to all."—Professor WILLIAM A. FERGUSON, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Address BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, Oberlin, Ohio

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMBINATION OFFERS FOR 1913

BOOKS—POSTAGE PAID IN ALL COUNTRIES

\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
2.17	Origin and Antiquity of Man, by Wright	
<u>\$5.17</u>	<i>Both for \$4.75</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
1.65	Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism by Kyle	
<u>\$4.65</u>	<i>Both for \$4.25</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
2.17	Pentateuchal Studies, by Wright	
<u>\$5.17</u>	<i>Both for \$4.75</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
1.65	Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, by Wright	
<u>\$4.65</u>	<i>Both for \$4.25</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
.40	Origin of the Pentateuch, by Wright	
<u>\$3.40</u>	<i>Both for \$3.25</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
2.17	Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, by Wright	
<u>\$5.17</u>	<i>Both for \$4.75</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
5.30	Ice Age in North America (revised, and enlarged edition), by Wright	
<u>\$8.30</u>	<i>Both for \$7.00</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
1.62	Miracle and Science, by Lamb	
<u>\$4.62</u>	<i>Both for \$4.25</i>	
\$3.00	Bibliotheca Sacra for 1913	
.90	Person of Christ, by Merrell	
<u>\$3.90</u>	<i>Both for \$3.25</i>	

Special Combination Prices on Bibliotheca Sacra and other books, as
shown in the above mentioned books furnished on application.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA COMPANY, OBERLIN, OHIO, U. S. A.



